FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-204
Tuesday
24 October 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-204 CONTENTS *24 October 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Soviet General Discusses Arms Reduction in Asia *[Moscow International]* 1
'International Situation' Discusses Wyoming Talks
[Ptashnikov, Chernyshev, Levin, Surguchev, and Pravdin on Moscow Radio] 2
Savings From, Problems in INF Cuts Described *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* 4
U.S. Stand on Naval Arms Criticized *[(Dobrov) on Moscow International]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 23 Oct 8
    U.S. Allegations Against Nicaragua 8
    U.S. Aid to Cambodian Groups 8
    Arms Supplies to Afghanistan 8
    Shevardnadze Speech to Supreme Soviet 8
Willy Brandt Cites Moscow Talks, Future Plans *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* 9
Petrovskiy Briefs Newsmen on UNGA Session *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* 10
Primakov Meets With Roundtable Participants *[Moscow TV]* 11
Zagladin Addresses Rimini East-West Meeting *[PRAVDA 18 Oct]* 11
New Members of UN Security Council Named *[TASS]* 11

United States & Canada

Bush Wants CIA Covert Rules Changed *[TASS]* 12
Baker Comments on Soviet Ties, Arms Policy *[TASS]* 12
Baker's 'Tone' on Perestroyka Welcomed *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 13
TASS Notes Space Shuttle Atlantis' Landing 13

Northeast Asia

Sakharov Speaks on Developments in East Europe *[Tokyo TV]* 14
Japanese Paper's Criticism of Soviet Policy Hit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* 14
Japan Seen Hiding 'Realism' of 1950's Leaders *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 15

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Call for Pacific Naval Arms Control Talks Noted *[Melbourne International]* 16
U.S. 'Propaganda Campaign' Seen in Philippines *[Moscow International]* 16
Council of Ministers Condolences on SRV Typhoon *[TASS]* 16
Education Agreement With Vietnam Signed *[TASS]* 16

Near East & South Asia

Rafsanjani Gives News Conference in Tehran *[TASS]* 16
Ministers To Visit Iran in December *[IRNA]* 17
Expansion of Iran's Tourism Industry Viewed *[Moscow International]* 17
Renewed Export of Iranian Gas to USSR Noted *[Sheftunov on Moscow International]* 17
Road Opened from Soviet Border to Afghan Interior *[TASS]* 18
Afghan Rebels' New Tactics Analyzed *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 18
Pakistan Aiding Afghan Rebels' Drug Activities *[TASS]* 19
Afghan Complaint on Road Attacks, UN Aid Cited *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 20
Saudi 'Spy' Sentenced to 20 Years in Afghanistan *[TASS]* 20
Saudi Arabia Congratulated on Proclamation Day *[TASS]* 20

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Ethiopian Leader's Unity Appeal Cited *[IZVESTIYA 21 Oct]* 20
- Ethiopian Talks on 'Brink of Disruption' *[Moscow International]* 21
- CPSU Delegation Returns From Ethiopia *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 21

East Europe

- Akhromeyev: Warsaw Pact 'Alliance of Interests' *[East Berlin Radio]* 21
- Shevardnadze Arrives in Warsaw 24 Oct *[TASS]* 21
- Solidarity, PZPR Clash at Sosnowiec Mine Worsens *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Oct]* 22
- Hungary Experiencing 'Responsible Stage' *[Moscow International]* 22
- Szuros Cited on Renaming of Hungarian Republic *[TASS]* 22
- Hungarian Party Law Debate Reported *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 23
- Passions Run High Over Hungarian Election *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 23
- Political Changes in GDR Discussed *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 24
- Krenz Meeting With Berlin Workers Noted *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 24
- SED Develops Dialogue With Public *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 25
- Bovin on E. European Socialism, Market Economics *[Moscow TV]* 26
- State of Soviet-Albanian Relations Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 26
- Yazov Greets SFRY's Kadijevic on Anniversary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* 27

West Europe

- Officials Reaffirm Wallenberg Death in 1947 *[TASS]* 27
- News Conference Held in Helsinki on Perestroyka *[Helsinki International]* 28
- Finnish Officials Preview Gorbachev Visit 28
    - SSDP Party Chief Iivari *[TASS]* 28
    - Parliament Speaker Sorsa *[TASS]* 29

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

- Committee Hears Kryuchkov Report on Border Guards *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Oct]* 30
- Gorbachev Interviewed on Work of Supreme Soviet *[Prague TV]* 30
- Moscow TV Carries 23 Oct Supreme Soviet Session 31
    - 1600 GMT 31
    - 1712 GMT 31
    - 1812 GMT 32
    - 2007 GMT 33
- PRAVDA Reports 23 Oct Supreme Soviet Debate *[24 Oct]* 33
- Lukyanov Proposes Constitutional Changes *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 35
    - Deputies Discuss Lukyanov Report *[Moscow Radio]* 38
    - Lukyanov Responds to Deputy *[Moscow Radio]* 38
    - Further on Debate *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 39
    - Gorbachev on Electoral Changes *[Moscow TV]* 40
    - Debate Summed Up *[TASS]* 41
- Shevardnadze 23 Oct Foreign Policy Report *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 42
- Lukyanov Chairs 24 Oct Constitution Debate *[TASS]* 52

Political & Social

- Gorbachev Meets With Members of PRAVDA 53
    - Expresses Gratitude *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 53
    - Introduces Chief Editor Frolov *[Moscow TV]* 53
    - New Chief Editor Profiled *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 54
- Kazakh Deputy Discusses Nuclear-Free Zone *[Moscow Radio]* 54
- Kirgizia Steps up Antidrug Activity *[TASS]* 55
- Tajik Party Censures Vernacular Press *[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 6 Oct]* 55
- Azerbaijan Party Meeting on NKAO Reported *[Baku Radio]* 57
    - Political Settlement Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 57

Bayramov Discusses Azerbaijan's Sovereignty *[Baku Radio]* 57
'Worsening' Economic Condition in NKAO Noted *[Yerevan Radio]* 58
Update on Arrival of Trains in Armenia *[Yerevan Radio]* 58
Armenian Unity Urged To Face Hostile Elements *[KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN 5 Oct]* 58
Armenians Thank Ukrainians for Help *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Armenians Commemorate U.S. Quake Victims *[Yerevan International]* 59
Crimeans Protest Nuclear Power Plant Construction *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 29 Sep]* 59
  Science Academy Opposes Crimean AES *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 5 Oct]* 60
Discrepancies in Ukrainian Plenum Coverage *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 61
Moldavian Front's March Causes Disturbances *[TASS]* 61
Belorussian Language Bill Submitted to Parliament *[TASS]* 62
Lithuanian Party's Independence Examined *[LITERATURA IR MENAS No 41]* 62
Lithuania Introduces Travel Restrictions *[Vilnius International]* 63
'Radio Free Europe's' Policies Questioned *[TIESA 20 Aug]* 63
Christmas Declared Legal Holiday in Lithuania *[Moscow Radio]* 64
Latvians Seek Guarantees of Republic Sovereignty *[IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]* 64
Latvian Peoples Front Draft Program Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Oct]* 64
Vagris Discusses Latvian Communist Party CC Plenum 66
  Analyzes Results *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 6 Sep]* 66
Writer P. Afanasyev on Baltic Republics *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Oct]* 68
Vorkuta Miners Association Resumes Strike *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 71
Coalminers Strike in Kemerovo Oblast *[TASS]* 71
  Further on Mezhdurechensk Strike *[TASS]* 72
Explosion Delays Pipeline Operation *[Moscow TV]* 72
Konarev on Railroad Holdups, Iran Border Problem *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 73
Ministry on Goods Accumulation at Border Points *[TASS]* 73
RSFSR People's Front Formed *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 74
More on 13 Oct RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Oct]* 74
Problems of Criminal Investigation Aired *[TRUD 18 Oct]* 75
Goskomstat Chairman Gives Economic Figures *[Moscow TV]* 75
  Economic Development Viewed *[TASS]* 76
Amendments to USSR Law on Cooperative System *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 76
Government Discusses Draft Pension Law 13 Oct *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 77
Leningrad United Front of Working People Meets *[TASS]* 78
Belitskiy on Radio During Stalin, Brezhnev Era *[Moscow International]* 78
Article Critical of Historian Afanasyev Reprinted *[TASS]* 79
IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS No 10 Reviewed *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 79
Editor of RODINA Journal Decribes Publication *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 80
CPSU's Manayenkov Attends Bibliophiles' Conclave *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 81

Economic

Gorbachev Chairs Meeting of Leading Economists *[TASS]* 81
Council of Ministers Examines Economic Data *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 81
Economist Urges Curbing Wage Increases *[TRUD 29 Sep]* 83
Economic Methods of Quality Control Urged
  [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 17 Oct] 85

Agricultural

Stroyev Addresses Seminar on Food Production *[PRAVDA 18 Oct]* 87
Students Suffer Chemical Illnesses in Sverdlovsk *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Kirghizia Bans Food Exports From Republic *[Moscow Radio]* 89
Agricultural Report for 17-22 Oct Period *[Moscow Radio]* 89

Military

Akhromeyev notes 1990 military spending cuts *[East Berlin Radio]* 89
57 Die in Transcaucusus Crash of Il-76 Transport *[Moscow TV]* 90
Chernavin Discusses Aircraft Carrier Policy *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 90

Soviet General Discusses Arms Reduction in Asia

OW2110033889 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Interview with Major General Yuriy Markelov, director of the General Staff Press Center of the Soviet Armed Forces, by unidentified reporter; from the "New Thinking and the Contemporary World" program—date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] It is now a well-known fact that the Soviet Union has decided to undertake a unilateral reduction of half a million troops, beginning this year, and a substantial cut in conventional weapons. In the context of this general plan, what are the steps being planned and implemented by the USSR in its Asian region? Our reporter interviewed Major General Yuriy Markelov, director of the General Staff Press Center of the Soviet Armed Forces, regarding this.

The Soviet Armed Forces are composed of serveral branches, including ground, air, air defense, and naval forces. How and to what degree will the ongoing process of arms reduction affect the services? In answer to this question, Maj Gen Markelov states:

[Begin Markelov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] Extensive changes will occur in all these services. For example, the number of ground force divisions will be reduced to about half, and about 60 units of the air defense force will be either demobilized or reduced. The air force plans to demobilize 4 air wings [koku-gun] and about 20 air units [koku-tai]. As for the Navy, units to be reduced include several fleets, a [word indistinct] regiment [rentai], a coastal defense rocket unit, a naval infantry unit, and a news, information, and logistics unit. Some 26 submarines and 45 surface ships will be reduced from its battleship ranks. Of course, all the above units are connected with the plans for arms reduction in the Asian region.

Maj Gen Markelov stated in concrete terms the reduction of the Soviet troops in the eastern area as follows:

[Begin Markelov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] The troops in the eastern USSR will be reduced by 200,000 by 1 January 1991. We have already abolished the Central Asian Military District and the Ural Military District. In addition, a total of four armies [gun], including two under the Trans-Baykal Military District and one each under the Far East Military District and the Turkestan Military District, and a total of three army corps [gundan], including one under the Far East Military District and two under the Turkestan Military District, are scheduled to be demobilized. Morever, as a result of the normalization of the relations between the Soviet Union and China, we have already started the process of reducing and reorganizing the Soviet troops stationed along the Soviet-Chinese border. The military structure has been changed into a system devoted solely to defense.[end recording]

Maj Gen Markelov was asked to explain how the improvement in Soviet relations with China has influenced the Soviet troop deployment in Mongolia.

[Begin Markelov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] Within the framework of our plan for unilateral arms reduction, we are also engaged in withdrawing Soviet troops from the People's Repubic of Mongolia, where they have been temporarily stationed. To date, we have withdrwan one tank division and three accompanying brigades from Mongolia, and demobilized one Air Force division. As a result, we have withdrawn a total number of approximately 23,000 men and officers, 404 tanks, 370 cannons, and 41 fighter airplanes. By January 1991, 75 percent of the ground forces and all Air Force units will be withdrawn from Mongolia. This will include a total of five divisions—two tank divisions, one mobile division, and two Air Force divisions—and several other units. All these divisions and units are composed of over 20,000 troops, over 850 tanks, about 1,100 motorized infantry vehicles and armored transport vehicles, 820 cannons of various types, about 190 airplanes, and 130 helicopters.[end recording]

Maj Gen Markelov then discussed the Soviet Far East troops.

[Begin Markelov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] Soviet troops stationed in the Far East will be reduced by 100,000 from 1989 to 1990. In the Far East, 12 ground divisions will be withdrawn and 11 Air Force regiments [rentai] will be demobilized. The Pacific Fleet will be reduced by 16 battleships. The remaining units will be assigned defense duties.[end recording]

All these actions, as well as other concrete actions, clearly indicate that the Soviet Union earnestly wants to prevent military threat and that it has never had, and will never have, any ulterior motives underlying lasting peace or extensive international cooperation. This is what Maj Gen Markelov stated.

However, some people in foreign nations have been repeatedly mentioning the so-called Soviet threat in Asia.

[Begin Markelov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] As always, certain circles in various nations, including the United States and Japan, imagine our nation as the enemy and attempt to scare their people by using such terms as a Soviet military buildup. However, such thinking has nothing to do with the facts. This pretext is based on giving priority to their attempts to justify their own military policies and to attain military superiority. In fact, what should be viewed as an issue is not the Soviet but the U.S. military presence in the Asia-Pacific region. In this region, a large amount of U.S. forces are concentrated. There are over 530,000 troops, 7 aircraft carriers, about 200 battleships, including 34 vessels equipped with cruise missiles, and over 1,200 warplanes, including over 600 aircraft loaded with nuclear weapons. This is supplemented by the

Japanese military strength, consisting of 27,000 troops, over 450 warplanes, and over 130 battle and patrol ships.[end recording]

Maj Gen Markelov was asked to comment on the Soviet military strength in this region in concrete terms.

[Begin Markelov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] The Soviet forces in the Far East include 326,000 troops, 870 warplanes—including 470 attack planes—and 55 large surface vessels—including 2 aircraft carriers. In this connection, the ratio of troop strength and weapons is as follows: While having more than double the military strength of the Soviet Union, the United States and Japan have about four times the number of surface vessels of major classes compared to the Soviet Union. While having absolute supremacy in the number of surface vessels loaded with cruise missiles, they have more than double the number of attack planes compared to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has superiority in the number of tanks, armored transport vehicles, and cannons, but these weapons do not play a decisive role. From a strategic viewpoint, this supremacy in ground force weapons can offset only part of the U.S. and Japanese supremacy in military strength. When we talk about a military threat in the Asia-Pacific region, it should be kept in mind that the threat does not originate in the Soviet Union. [end recording]

'International Situation' Discusses Wyoming Talks

LD2110180389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 20 Oct 89

["International Situation—Questions and Answers"—presented by Andrey Ptashnikov, foreign political commentator for All-Union Radio, with Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, TASS military affairs observer, and commentators Viktor Levin, Igor Surguchev, and Sergey Pravdin]

[Excerpt] [Ptashnikov] Hello, comrades. As usual, I start our broadcast with replies to questions which crop up most frequently in listeners' letters.

Familiarizing oneself with the incoming mail, one is constantly reminded that Soviet-U.S. relations and the problem of disarmament remain at the center of your attention, comrades. And this time there are quite a few such letters. There is probably nothing surprising in this, inasmuch as the direct dependence of the international situation on how relations between the USSR and the United States are developing is generally recognized.

How are the talks on arms control progressing? As you know, comrades, certain progress has been achieved here recently, mainly thanks to the constructive, flexible position of the Soviet Union. In this connection, a few of our listeners express misgivings as to whether we are not going too far in our wish to step up the process of disarmament and are not placing excessive trust in the United States. After all, for the time being, the United States, to put it mildly, is acting reserved in its relations with us; and in its military policy in particular, it is continuing to work for the realization of the notorious Strategic Defence Initiative and is also continuing to modernize other types of weapons. It is about this that, for instance, Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov from the village of Krivozerye, Penza Oblast; Arkadiy Vasilyevich Sidnev from the town of Dzerzhinsk, Gorkiy Oblast; Nikolay Yefimovich Sokov from the town of Rovniki, Ivanovo Oblast, and a few others write in their letters.

In this connection, many listeners request us to return to the talks which took place late in September in the United States between USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Comrade Shevardnadze and President Bush and Secretary of State Baker. The letter writers want to learn in greater detail about the positions of the sides at these talks and also about the content of the accords reached.

I remind you that at the meetings in Washington and in the state of Wyoming, virtually all aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations and of the situation on the planet as a whole were discussed. Regarding the problems of disarmament, the sides signed, for instance, a joint statement regarding their common striving towards signing as soon as possible an interantional convention on chemical weapons. Substantial progress was achieved in strategic offensive armaments. Now there is hope that at the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting—and, if you recall, it is planned for the end of the spring, the beginning of the summer, of next year—the long-awaited treaty on a 50 percent reduction of these armaments will be signed.

The sides have advanced to a better understanding of one another's positions in limiting underground nuclear tests and reducing conventional arms.

Very briefly, these are the main results of the discussions which took place in the state of Wyoming.

But now, in accordance with your request, I want to move on to a more detailed analysis of these discussions. I think that you will agree with me that it is best done by a specialist. That is why I invited TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev to take part in our broadcast.

So then, Vladimir Nikolayevich, taken as a whole, how do you assess the results of the meeting in Wyoming, and what new things, in your view, has it brought to Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Chernyshev] I would begin to reply to this question with some prehistory. The 8 months which have elapsed since George Bush arrived in the White House have been for the Soviet leadership and the new U.S. Administration a period of mutual adaptation. The natural process of determining political priorities, of studying and drawing up variants and of developing ideas of what is possible and of what can be achieved was under way. A lengthy analysis of the global situation, including Soviet-U.S. relations and the state of affairs at various talks, has been taking place in Washington. The general strategic survey of U.S. foreign and military policies set itself the aim—as the U.S. press wrote—of ensuring the compatibility of U.S. obligations with strategy, military potential, and resources.

This lengthy pause has given rise to quite a few contradictory forecasts in the world. Finally, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting took place in the United States. In Gorbachev's message to the U.S. President, which was delivered by Comrade Shevardnadze, the Soviet leader advocated setting about resolving the questions on the Soviet-U.S. agenda. Set out in the letter were new ideas and considerations leading to agreement and accords on a number of major problems.

The meetings with President Bush and Secretary of State Baker have shown that the U.S. leadership also intends to work intensively with a view to achieving practical results, broadening the base of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in various fields. In this connection, James Baker noted: We progressed from confrontation to dialogue, and now also to cooperation, to joint actions with a view to resolving common problems encompassing a broad range of issues within the framework of the agenda. In Wyoming the sides reached a number of fundamental agreements on a whole series of questions. I think that each of them is important in itself, but at the same time they are important as symptoms of a new approach which now predominates in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Of course, serious disagreements still remain. But the readiness to constructively and frankly remove disagreements is something new which should be welcomed.

[Ptashnikov] Still, in what respect have the USSR and the United States already reached agreement? In which spheres has there been a rapprochement of the sides' positions, and where perhaps has the path been cleared to complete the drawing up of an agreement?

(Chernyshev] The road has been opened for the ratification and bringing into force of the treaties signed back in 1974 and 1976 and, until now, not ratified. These are the treaty on limiting underground nuclear weapons tests and the treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions. Concrete steps to meet one another halfway were taken here and a few complicated matters of monitoring [kontrol] were agreed on. One cannot ignore the fact that there has been an exchange of serious advances between the Soviet Union and the United States in the matter of reducing conventional armed forces in Europe. In response to the constructive proposal by the U.S. President at the NATO anniversary session in Brussels, providing for a reduction in aircraft [aviatsionnye sredstva], the Soviet Union has agreed for all aircraft of the frontline tactical aviation—and not only strike aircraft—to be included as subjects of the Vienna talks.

In my view, it is also necessary to single out the question of chemical weapons. The Soviet Union and the United States have signed a memorandum providing for the exchange of data on stockpiles of this weapon and the on-site inspection [proverka na mestakh] of these data. At the UN, Bush stated the U.S. readiness to start now, together with the Soviet Union, the destruction of chemical weapons and to scrap over 80 percent of its stockpiles if the USSR, jointly with the United States, reduces its arsenal to the same extent. On behalf of our country, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze expressed readiness, together with the United States, to go further, and without awaiting the conclusion of a multilateral convention to halt the production of chemical weapons—which has already been done in the USSR—and, on a bilateral basis, radically reduce or completely destroy chemical means of war.

Finally, serious new ideas have been put forward which without doubt can advance the negotiations on nuclear and space arms which are now being conducted in Geneva.

[Ptashnikov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, talking of the negotiations in Geneva, could you dwell in greater detail on the prospects opening up at these negotiations in connection with the progress made in Wyoming?

[Chernyshev] a number of obstacles impeding the conclusion of an agreement on reducing strategic offensive armaments were removed for these negotiations . One obstacle, the demand for a ban on mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles, was withdrawn by the U.S. side. It is well known that the Soviet Union is deploying two types of such missiles: the SS-24 with 10 nuclear warheads, and the SS-25 with 1 warhead. Until recently, at the negotiations the United States demanded a ban on the deployment of such missiles, but now this demand has been withdrawn. It is true that in doing so the U.S. Administration set a condition making the withdrawal dependent on the U.S. Congress positively resolving the allocation of funds for the development of U.S. mobile land-based missiles. But immediately after Wyoming, the Senate allocated such funds to the Administration.

For its part, the Soviet Union put forward a new idea which makes it possible to resolve the problem of air-launched cruise missiles. The essence of the disagreement lay in the sides' different approaches to the rules of counting such missiles on heavy bomber aircraft. For this reason the Soviet Union proposed a new counting procedure based on the real level of equipment of aircraft with cruise missiles, that is to say, that on each aircraft, the maximum number of missiles for which it is equipped should be counted. I think that this is a fair position which does not harm the security interests of either participant in the talks.

On the issue of sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCM), the Soviet Union also put forward a new approach to resolving this complex problem. It raised the possibility of taking missiles of this type into account— not directly in the treaty of strategic offensive armaments, but in the wider context of reducing and limiting of naval armaments. At the negotiations in Geneva, however, the USSR proposed that one should concentrate on resolving the question of monitoring these missiles.

The U.S. side stated its readiness to study these new ideas, but at the same time stressed its doubt regarding the possibility of effectively monitoring SLCMs.

Nonetheless, it would seem that the possibility of taking the problems of limitations on such missiles outside the framework of the negotiations on nuclear and space ars will facilitate reaching an accord on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments.

Finally one should especially single out the Soviet proposals on antimissile defense and space, proposals which opened up the path to reaching and implementing a treaty on strategic offensive armaments without concluding an agreement on space armaments. They mean that the USSR is prepared also to sign and ratify a treaty on strategic offensive armament also in the event an accord on the ABM problem has not been reached by the time the drawing up of the treaty has been completed. In this way the main knot impeding the talks has been untangled.

[Ptashnikov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, another question: It is well known that some people in the United States, and, for that matter, also in our country, initially regarded the new approach to talks on nuclear and space armaments voiced in Wyoming as a retreat or a concession by the USSR on questions of principle, inasmuch as previously it had insisted on a close linkage between an accord on strategic offensive weapons and space weapons. What can you say about this?

[Chernyshev] In this connection I would like to stress that the Soviet Union's attitude to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, that is to say SDI, which provides for the creation of a large-scale antimissile defense operating in space remains negative. Our country keeps insisting that the sides should continue to abide by the ABM Treaty which bans the development and deployment of such systems. It believes that if one of the sides does not abide by the ABM Treaty, the other side will have the right to withdraw from the treaty on reducing strategic offensive armaments. To this end, the appropriate obligation must be recorded in the treaty. Moreover, the USSR proposed at the Geneva negotiations that a single interpretation be drawn up about what, after all, may and may not be done in space. The Soviet Union does not rule out the possibility of limited activity beyond the boundaries of laboratories—that is to say, research and field tests, including those in space, of devices which are not components of the banned antimissile defense systems.

I would also like to point to the alarm sounded in the United States by SDI supporters and opponents of reductions of strategic arms. It was very convenient for them to use the previous Soviet linkage between strategic offensive arms and space arms to erect a barrier at the Geneva negotiations. As the saying goes, they slept soundly in their beds. But that barrier has been removed, and moreover, as the U.S. press admits, the last propaganda argument artifically created in the United States in favor of the SDI program has been removed. Well, judge now whether our country is giving up its positions of principle. I think not.

[Ptashnikov] Thank you, Vladimir Nikolayevich. [passage omitted]

Savings From, Problems in INF Cuts Described

PM2010134189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with G. Khromov, acting chief of department at the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission (not further identified), by Colonel A. Belousov: "What Is the Cost of Explosions. The Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles in Operation"—no place or date of interview given; first three paragraphs are an introduction]

[Text] "Has anyone calculated how much the implementation of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles [INF Treaty] will cost the state?"

"U.S. specialists talk about an annual amount of $50 million in direct costs alone. Our expenses are also considerable...."

The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent's questions were answered by G. Khromov, acting chief of department at the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission.

[Belousov] Gennadiy Konstantinovich, the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty has now been in operation for almost 17 months. We regularly inform our readers of progress in the elimination of missiles and the work by specialists, inspection groups, and control centers. Nonetheless, there is an enduring interest in this topic. The nature of this interest is changing. Authors of letters to the editorial office ask not so much about the technology of missile destruction as about the available opportunities to preserve expensive equipment, materials, and former military materiel and bring them back into the national economy. Is it altogether possible, readers ask, to talk about conversion within the framework of the INF Treaty's implementation?

[Belousov] It is not altogether correct to use the term "conversion" in this context, even though the mass media often use it in the sense of restitution or preservation. But this would happen in any event. It is worse when some "specialists" take it on themselves to pass judgment on matters about which they are inadequately informed, and produce misleading information as a result. I have here MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No. 40 (1 October 1989). It carries an article entitled "Blasting Away Money." It is accompanied by a photograph captioned "RSD-10 launcher.... The majority of these have already been blown up, and the rest are in for it, too...." What is this, if not misleading information pure and simple? After all, not a single one of our 509 installations of this kind has been blown up. Missiles are being demolished by explosion, but this certainly does not apply to their launchers. As of today, around 300 of them have left the missile elimination sites and either already are being used or will be used in the national economy.

To continue.... The article claims that the Soviet Union has "opted for" the simplest but also the most wasteful method of missile elimination, the explosive demolition method, whereas the Americans have chosen a wiser way—they have started burning out the motors of each missile stage and utilizing the rest. If only we were to adopt the method used by the Americans, according to the author's calculations, we should be able to save superstrong steel, titanium, tungsten, and other materials worth around R1 million. The state would gain a further sum of about R5 million by preserving the steering mechanisms intact of missile stages and utilizing them in machine building. Add to this a vast quantity of aluminum oxide which is in short supply, and which can supposedly be obtained if missile stages were burned up. As well as superstrong glass-reinforced plastic tubing. If we were to take into account tanks, infantry combat vehicles, artillery guns.... Briefly speaking, the author has managed to calculate that the elimination of arms could result in the national economy's recovering state funds running to more than R20 billion. Come on now! If we carry on this way, we will end up recovering more than the actual cost of the arms!

Fair enough, let us assume that someone might have slipped in his calculations. Could it be that the suggestions contained in the article might be useful in principle? Judge for yourselves.... For example, how could anyone seriously suggest using steering mechanisms as power sources for machine tools, seeing that these mechanisms are designed for a brief one-shot use in missile flight, and their capacity is calculated in terms of seconds, or of minutes at most. Many of the author's other suggestions are equally useless in terms of practical implementation. They resemble the idea of transforming moonlight into electricity—it is theoretically possible, but when it comes to practice.... As regards the recovery of glass-reinforced plastic tubes, the treaty provides that not a single component of missile airframes or rocket motor cases can be preserved for use for any other purpose.

[Belousov] In that case, Gennadiy Konstantinovich, let me ask you something in your capacity as a member of our delegation to the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms. Why was the following condition not covered at the stage of the INF Treaty's preparation: Missiles shall cease to exist as weapons, but they shall not be literally destroyed and can be used for peaceful purposes?

[Khromov] The INF Treaty is a political document. Like any other document of that kind, it is a compromise between the sides. To comply with the treaty, we are doing certain things which we would not wish to do, and the Americans are doing the same. The idea of using intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles for satellite launches might appear attractive at first glance, but it is unacceptable because of these missiles' inadequate power capacity. So, what is to be done—fit them with additional stages? Or develop [sozdavat] a new guidance system for them? This would result in the development [razrabotka] of a new missile. Scientists and specialists also examined other options. Like, for example, using missiles due for destruction for geophysical purposes. But the countries need 30-40 such missiles a year. The total number of missiles is in excess of 2,500. So this elimination method would take decades. Consequently, the implementation of the INF Treaty would also stretch over decades. Could the missiles not be sunk in the ocean? I must say that this proposal was also made. But it also had to be rejected because there is no guarantee that the fuel components would not produce environmental pollution with the passage of time. Consequently, we settled on explosive demolition.

[Belousov] But why was burning turned down?

[Khromov] In order to eliminate missiles by burning their individual stages, it is necessary to break them down into stages in the first place, and the RSD-10 missile would have to be extracted from its container. These operations involve the potential risk of fire or explosion. They can be performed only in specially equipped plant-type premises using special bench equipment. The forces have no such facilities. Should we build them? This would entail unjustified expense, let alone the violations of elimination schedules.

[Belousov] But the explosive demolition of missiles also involves costs. Incidentally, Gennadiy Konstantinovich, has anyone calculated how much the implementation of the INF Treaty will cost the state?

[Khromov] U.S. specialists talk about an annual amount of $50 million in direct costs alone. Our expenses are also considerable. Costs are associated both with elimination itself and with verification. After all, the two sides have almost 150 facilities liable to inspection [inspektsiya], and the number of actual inspections runs into hundreds. One single IL-62 flight to the United States costs R240,000. Inspectors then have to be looked after, accommodation and catering have to be organized, and transportation has to be provided. Add to this the cost of verification apparatus. For example, the Americans have delivered sundry apparatus worth $10 million, including X-ray equipment to be used on railroad cars leaving the plant, to the Votkinsk machine building plant which originally manufactured the SS-20 missiles. Even assuming that this apparatus remains in service throughout the 13 years during which the plant is liable to inspection, the cost is still almost 1 million per annum.

[Belousov] The picture looks gloomy. Huge sums were originally invested in the development [sozdaniye] of missiles, and considerable expenditure will have to be incurred now that the time has come to eliminate them.

[Khromov] But we must not forget that this expenditure, just like the treaty itself, stems from the need to ensure mankind's survival in the nuclear missile age. The treaty's implementation is the first-ever real destruction of two classes of nuclear weapons in world history, so it is rather hard to overestimate this act's importance from the political viewpoint. It is also tremendously promising from the economic viewpoint—arms are being reduced, and military expenditure will, naturally, also be reduced. Furthermore, let me emphasize again that when we talk of "destruction" or "elimination," this should not be taken literally as meaning that everything will be reduced to dust. Individual elements, which contain precious metals and can be dismantled without breaching the treaty's provisions, are being removed. The targeting system is also being removed, and at times it represents one-half of the whole missile's cost.

[Belousov] To what future use will targeting systems be put?

[Khromov] Missile targeting systems which were developed [sozdavalis] 20-30 years ago are, of course, now outdated. They are being partially utilized, with all their valuable components being removed. The new targeting systems can be used for peaceful purposes. As regards missile erectors and transporters, the situation is as follows: Certain components and mechanisms are being cut away from the chassis, and the transporters as such remain.

[Belousov] It is well known that the Odessa heavy crane building association named for the January Uprising, jointly with the West German "Liebherr" Firm, has assembled a construction site crane with a lifting capacity of 100 tonnes using an SS-20 missile tractor unit. It was highly appraised by experts at the Munich international exhibition. Has the series production of these cranes now been organized?

[Khromov] It is still too soon to talk about series production. Here is the reason why. The SS-20 launcher's chassis is of a unique design. It can carry a load twice its weight. It is assisted in carrying such loads by the missile container, which itself is designed for heavy-duty purposes. Take the container off, and the chassis could prove weak. So the designers still have to think about it.

We are now also working on the possibility of using missile tractors for the transportation of oil, fuel, and large cargoes. The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Ministry of Motor Transport, for example, has already received 18 SS-20 missile tractors.

[Belousov] It is quite easy for the Ministry of Motor Transport.... But how about an enterprise or a collective farm? In order to acquire something, they must know that this "something" is being sold by someone. What procedure will be adopted, generally speaking, for handing back to the national economy any equipment that is being released, as well as the buildings and installations which will be left behind following the elimination of missile operating bases?

[Khromov] We are working on the transmission mechanism. For example, an exhibition and sale of military equipment withdrawn from service will be held for this purpose in Moscow's Sokolniki Park in November 1989. It is being organized by the Ministry of Defense and the All-Union Association of Scientific-Technical, Cooperative, and Economically Accountable Organizations and Enterprises.

[Belousov] Is it not quite likely that smart operators will do quite well out of this?

[Khromov] This is how profits will be distributed: One part will go to the Ministry of Defense for development of the social and consumer services spheres, another part will go to the state budget and the exhibition directorate, and around 5 percent will go to the association.

Nonetheless, the bulk of savings will be effected not through the utilization of equipment, which has already served its time in the forces, but through the corresponding armed forces reductions and the end of expensive utilization of arms and combat equipment. The "supplementary earnings"—which are actually not supplementary earnings but real savings—to be gained by the state through the INF Treaty will amount to hundreds of millions of rubles a year. The Americans calculate that, following the treaty's implementation, their military expenditure will be reduced by $450 million a year.

U.S. Stand on Naval Arms Criticized

LD2110171989 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Commentary by military observer (Mikhail Dobrov)]

[Text] When observers analyzed the results of the third round of the Vienna talks they stressed the steady advance toward the goal the reduction of the ground and air forces in Europe; and what about the naval force? The answer to this question has been given by our military observer (Mikhail Dobrov), and this is what he writes.

The naval force stands outside the count so far, though not to count it means to make the disarmament process imperfect in advance. The naval force, for example, has not been included in the mandate at the Vienna talks. NATO's position and the similar position of the United States on the naval force is well known. The naval force should remain intact. It's claimed that the United States spends more than the Soviet Union on sea shipments of fuel and other resources; this was stressed by the American naval chief of staff, Admiral Carlisle Trost, when he visited this country in the middle of October. One can agree only on one point, that the marine economic interests do exist, though it's hard to say how much more important they are if compared with the land or the air space. In any event, the [word indistinct] limitation or reduction of the naval force can do no damage to these interests.

In general, to consider the Soviet Union to be less dependent on sea than the United States is arguable. After all, out of more than 60,000 km of the Soviet Union's state borders, 43,000 are sea borders. And the argument about the orientation of the American naval force to the protection of sea lanes cannot help but arouse protests. So much was already said about American bases around the Soviet Union and about 15 striking aircraft carrying units capable of hitting this country's territory.

While staying in the Soviet Union, Adm Trost also made this point:

[Begin Trost recording] We are equipping submarines and surface ships with missiles—cruise missiles—some of which will be land attack, a small number of which will have nuclear capability. [end recording]

The question arises: Isn't it too much for the modest purpose of protecting sea lanes?

The Soviet commander in chief of the Naval Force, Admiral Vladimir Chernavin, has assessed the situation in the following way:

[Begin Chernavin recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] Our American partners do all they can today in order to leave their naval force outside the agenda. They have advantages in certain aspects and they don't want to part with them. [Words indistinct] that the United States is more a sea power than we are, that its sea performs the function of a communication with the allies and as a protection, and we as a land power can use trains, doesn't correspond to reality, concluded Adm Chernavin. [end recording]

So, mutual distrust and inability to understand each other—this is what we run into in the naval sphere. It seems that we've overcome that barrier in relation to land and air forces. As far as the naval forces are concerned, we are only approaching it, and we hope that the stepped-up contacts between Soviet and American military will help surmount this obstacle as well.

TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 23 Oct

U.S. Allegations Against Nicaragua

LD2310145489 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The accusations of arms shipments to Salvadoran rebels raised by U.S. State Department spokeswoman Margaret Tutwiler against Nicaragua undermine mutual understanding between the five Central American countries and hamper a settlement in the region, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing today.

The accusations were made after Honduran authorities captured a van with Salvadoran number plates carrying weapons.

The Nicaraguan side rejected allegations by the State Department spokeswoman and expressed readiness to admit U.N. inspectors to the border with El Salvador.

As a result, the international community would become convinced that Nicaragua does not supply arms to that country, the Soviet spokesman said.

Now that a Central American settlement has entered its final stage, Perfilyev pointed out, it is necessary to preserve the accumulated confidence and to avoid unsubstantiated accusations by using an efficient control mechanism.

U.S. Aid to Cambodian Groups

LD2310150389 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—United States arms deliveries to opposition Khmer groups are a new destabilising factor in the situation around Cambodia, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told journalists today.

He commented on Son Sann Khmer group representatives' reports that the United States supplies the opposition with space pictures of the west of Cambodia and trains members of its armed formations to handle antitank weapons and drive tanks.

Perfilyev stressed the need for international accord on termination of any assistance from outside to the Cambodian sides. This accord would prevent escalation of hostilities and a civil war in Cambodia. The Soviet Union has proposed a moratorium on military assistance to the Cambodian sides before the conclusion of such an agreement.

The Soviet side is confident that the realisation of these proposals will promote a ceasefire in Cambodia and resumption of a dialogue between the Cambodian sides, Perfilyev stressed. Moscow hopes for a positive U.S. response to these initiatives he said.

Arms Supplies to Afghanistan

LD2310153989 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev today blamed the continuing armed conflict in Afghanistan on the extremist opposition and its patrons eager to see the lawful Afghan government toppled. Aided and abetted by its patrons, the opposition have been waging vigorous offensive operations over the past eight months.

Speaking at a news briefing, Perfilyev commented on Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's statement that the Soviet Union ought to withdraw part of its arms from Afghanistan as this would allegedly help a political settlement there.

Perfilyev noted that following the Soviet troop withdrawal the Afghan armed forces have limited themselves to defensive activities. The opposition, however, has attacked cities and other populated localities every now and again.

This, he continued, was made possible by the ever more sophisticated and powerful weapons supplies by the opposition's patrons.

Although calling for a political settlement and the withdrawal of arms from Afghanistan, Pakistani authorities are encouraging the Afghan oppostion to escalate military activities, the spokesman said.

The way to accords lies not through an increase in combat but through a ceasefire, he stressed adding that a real political settlement could be aided by a constructive plan recently suggested by President Najibullah.

The plan envisages a ceasefire, broad-based interAfghan dialogue, and an international conference on the cessation of arms shipments to all Afghan sides.

"In the context of this plan, based on existing realities, it is possible to put an end to weapons supplies to Afghanistan from both sides and to the war, and to achieve long-awaited peace for the Afghans," Perfilyev said.

Shevardnadze Speech to Supreme Soviet

LD2310170789 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Soviet Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev briefed reporters today on Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's speech to parliament, reviewing Soviet foreign policy

Speaking of U.N. day which will be observed on Tuesday, Perfilyev said the international organisation's activities at present show a desire by states to jointly look for solutions to existing problems and to build bridges rather than stressing differences.

Commenting on Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's statement that the Soviet Union ought to withdraw part of its arms from Afghanistan, the spokesman said that while calling for a political settlement and the withdrawal of arms from Afghanistan, Pakistani authorities are encouraging the Afghan opposition to escalate military activities.

A real political settlement could be aided by a constructive plan recently suggested by President Najibullah, Perfilyev said. The plan envisages a ceasefire, broad-based interAfghan dialogue, and an international conference on the cessation of arms shipments to all Afghan sides.

The spokesman said also that the accusations of arms supplies to Salvadoran rebels raised by U.S. State Department spokeswoman Margaret Tutwiler against Nicaragua undermine mutual understanding between the five Central American countries and hamper a settlement in the region.

The accusations were made after Honduran authorities captured a van with Salvadoran number plates carrying weapons. The Nicaraguan side rejected allegations by the State Department spokeswoman and expressed readiness to admit U.N. inspectors to the border with El Salvador. As a result, the international community would become convinced that Nicaragua does not supply arms to that country, Perfilyev said.

United States arms deliveries to opposition Khmer groups are a new destabilising factor in the situation around Cambodia, he said.

He commented on Son San Khmer group representatives' reports that the United States suplies the opposition with space pictures of the West of Cambodia and trains members of its armed units to handle anti-tank weapons and drive tanks.

Perfilyev stressed the need for an international accord on the termination of any assistance from outside to the Cambodian sides.

Willy Brandt Cites Moscow Talks, Future Plans

PM1910151989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Socialist International Chairman Willy Brandt by A. Balandin and B. Lysenko under the headline "Willy Brandt: More Courage and Determination"; date and place unspecified]

[Text] [Correspondents] Mr Chairman, your party and you personally have long maintained ties with the Soviet Union. You are known as the "father of Ostpolitik." You recently spoke with M.S. Gorbachev. What did you find particularly noteworthy in this conversation?

[Brandt] First of all, M.S. Gorbachev's topical interpretation of the restructuring processes. The Soviet leader's remark that the disarmament talks in Vienna must not end in their first stage and that ways to continue these talks must be sought also seemed important to me. His heartfelt wish is that European cooperation will increasingly gather pace rather than develop with timid steps.

[Correspondents] What is your opinion as a whole of the situation now taking shape in the Soviet Union and of the prospects for developing relations between our countries and between the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] and the CPSU?

[Brandt] I think it would be rather presumptuous on my part to assess the situation in such a large country as the Soviet Union after a brief visit. The problems facing Soviet society are too diverse and multifaceted. But I have formed the belief that, despite certain difficulties, the country's leadership is maintaining clear, firm positions in the process of shaping a new way of thinking in the course of restructuring. This has made a positive impression on us. We also have very good memories of M.S. Gorbachev's last visit to the Federal Republic. I think he has good memories, too. That visit extended beyond the official government framework. It can be said that he was received by the whole nation with great warmth, liking, and openness. It is also worth remembering the very full meetings held between M.S. Gorbachev and FRG Federal Chancellor H. Kohl. The time is coming when signed agreements are beginning to be implemented rather than remaining as silent piles of paper on shelves.

Also worthy of note is the formation of a working group headed by V. Falin on the Soviet side and E. Bahr on the West German side. It is tasked with working out a specific framework for the idea known as the "common European home." There are not only security issues involved here but also legal questions. There must also be clarity in matters of economic exchange.

[Correspondents] Have you succeeded, in your view, in achieving the goals during your visit to Moscow which you set yourself when preparing for it?

[Brandt] Although the visit has been rather short, we have had some very important conversations. They have made a great impression on us. We have discussed ways and possibilities of cooperation. I must say that it has been a successful visit.

[Correspondents] You belong to the generation of politicians who had a considerable influence on the development of postwar Europe. You, Mr Chairman, have lived through the periods of confrontation and "cold war" and were one of the initiators of the policy of detente, with all its ups and downs. East-West relations are now developing better than they have ever done. Do you believe that the idea of a "common European home" is realistic and how, in your view, could it look? What role could the Socialist International play in its formation?

[Brandt] I intend to have a meeting in Milan at the beginning of November with one of the deputy chairmen of the Socialist International, who is responsible for the European region, and tell him about everything that was said in Moscow. All opinions must be discussed and an integrated approach worked out. I personally have nothing against the idea of a "common European home." In this respect I think we should first of all concentrate on a peaceful European order. Then we could clarify our positions with regard to the second part: We need joint problem-solving institutions for the whole of Europe which could study the questions of security, ecology, and also economic cooperation. This concerns both bilateral relations and relations between the "Common Market" and CEMA as a whole and individual members of CEMA. These three component parts, if we look ahead, must shape the picture of future collaboration. I do not overestimate their significance but they must play an important role in the building of such a "home."

[Correspondents] You have enormous political experience and authority in international affairs. What would you wish the politicians of today?

[Brandt] That would be hard to say in a few words, of course. I have already expressed some ideas on this. I would wish them greater courage in overcoming the notions of past years and greater determination in their approach to resolving global problems.

[Correspondents] There is talk of your planning to give up politics altogether. Do you really think that Willy Brandt has nothing more to say in European politics?

[Brandt] Speaking objectively, I would of course be right to take a rest now. But I have no intention of "slamming the book shut." Physically I feel fine. I was recently re-elected to the post of chairman of the Socialist International. I have a whole series of meetings and talks ahead of me, including with representatives of the Soviet Union, during which we will be discussing global problems that arise. There you have an approximate list of the work in which I intend to be actively involved. I now have to play a lesser role in the various events staged by the SPD, of which I was chairman for a long time. This does have its advantages: I now have the opportunity to read more and do a lot of thinking. I am trying to get the maximum possible out of this situation. I am satisfied that I was able to be involved in work to create good foundations for developing relations between our countries.

Petrovskiy Briefs Newsmen on UNGA Session

PM2010095789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by our correspondent G. Charodeyev at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center: "From Words to Action"]

[Text] The general political debate has ended at the 44th UN General Assembly session. It was attended by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy, who arrived in Moscow from New York the other day and addressed a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center.

"The main feature of the debate.," he noted, "was the common desire to engage in a joint quest for the solution of all the problems and contradictions that remain and, in a number of cases, are getting worse. You sense that states want not so much to accentuate the differences, as to build bridges across divisive allegiances and establish coordinated approaches, primarily via consensus. Soviet-American relations loomed large in the debate. It is indicative that the improvement of these relations does not give rise to any fear that less attention might be paid to the United Nations. The importance attached in the context of the Soviet-American dialogue to transnational issues is seen by the majority as an example of the complementary nature of bilateral and multilateral efforts. What can be described as "nonmilitary" security factors take center-stage along with disarmament and the resolution of conflicts. Most prominent is the desire to preserve the environment, which was mentioned in 130 speeches."

As the session moves on to the crucial next stage—consideration of specific agenda items in committees—the Soviet delegation sees it as its task to translate into the language of resolutions the ideas and proposals that are formulated in the well-known appeals to the United Nations by M.S. Gorbachev. Now that the United Nations has expanded from 51 to 159 states the organization has to play the part of a world democratic forum.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent put several questions to V.F. Petrovskiy.

[Charodeyev] At the New York press conference you indicated that the question of making more extensive use of UN peacekeeping forces merits special attention and that there is a possibility of providing Soviet and U.S. military contingents for peacekeeping operations. Could you explain what this issue is all about?

[Petrovskiy] This matter has been considered at the United Nations within the framework of a special political committee. UN peacekeeping operations, many people believe, have an important impact on the process of settling conflicts and crisis situations. Obviously their role is going to increase even more in the future. This gives rise to the question: How is one to make UN peacekeeping operations more effective in the future? We, for example, have raised the question of Soviet and U.S. forces participating in such operations. As is known, it was once considered when the United Nations was being set up. But the theme was not developed at the time. Now, in the new conditions of interdependence, which require joint efforts by all states, the participation of our military contingents would be useful. Especially as the experience of the participation of Soviet and U.S. officers as UN observers in, for example, the Near East, is very useful and is favored by all UN member states.

[Charodeyev] During the debate at the UN General Assembly session the question of halting nuclear tests was also touched on. In present conditions what specific steps can the United Nations take here?

[Petrovskiy] The theme of nuclear tests was very much in evidence at the session. Everyone knows where we stand—we are in favor of the immediate cessation of nuclear weapon tests and are prepared to declare a moratorium if the United States is prepared to do the same. What can the United Nations do in this sphere? A great deal. It can create the right political climate. After all, the nuclear powers do not exist in a vacuum. They are part of the overall political environment. What is more, in the multilateral diplomacy system there is a special organ which deals with nuclear test issues. It is the Disarmament Conference. There are long debates there about what its mandate should be. Given today's conditions, it is probably time to switch from the discussion of procedural matters to substantive debates and start discussing the question of banning nuclear tests, that is, prepare a relevant draft international treaty, the USSR deputy foreign minister said.

Primakov Meets With Roundtable Participants

LD1810232789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting took place in Moscow today between Comrade Primakov and participants in the international roundtable meeting entitled "East-West: How We See Each Other." Comrade Primakov briefed his guests on the work of the supreme organ of state power and talked about ways of further developing economic reform in the country and about problems of interethnic relations. Great attention was paid to issues of relations between the government and the press and the policy of glasnost and openness in the Soviet Union. [video shows Primakov and other participants seated at a table]

Zagladin Addresses Rimini East-West Meeting

PM1910140089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent N. Miroshnik report: "From Confrontation to Cooperation"]

[Text] Rome, 17 Oct—Questions of East-West relations were the subject of an international conference that ended today in the city of Rimini.

Speaking at the conference, Italian Prime Minister G. Andreotti noted that in the face of the changes taking place in the USSR and the other socialist countries, the West should not remain inert. "Our actions must strengthen this process, making it increasingly irreversible, up to the final transition from the policy of confrontation to the policy of cooperation," he stressed. At the same time, the premier said, this transition requires a gradual, cautious approach and noninterference in other people's affairs. The process of political and military detente, which is boosted by the policy of profound transformations being implemented in the Soviet Union, should also boost the process of economic detente, V.V. Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and adviser to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, noted, for his part.

As was stated at the conference, alongside the deepening of the process of East-West detente that is taking place "on the wave of Gorbachev's perestroyka," leading to a more lasting peace on the basis of cooperation, at the same time the contradictions caused by the growing gulf between rich and poor countries are continuing to be exacerbated.

At the same time it was hardly right for certain speakers to try to equate the urgent needs of the socialist countries with the needs of the developing states, and to put them on the same economic footing. The Soviet Union, USSR Finance Minister V. Pavlov stressed in response to such assertions, is capable of completing the process of reforms autonomously, independently of the West's help. Its assistance will be welcomed only if it does not entail any kind of discrimination. Those who talk about our country's "debts," the minister noted, should remember that the USSR as a whole is not a debtor, but a creditor. If you offset its foreign debt against the credits granted to other states, the balance is by no means negative.

New Members of UN Security Council Named

LD1810223789 Moscow TASS in English 1933 GMT 18 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 18 TASS—Under the United Nations Charter, the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly today elected five new non-permanent members of the Security Council for a term of two years beginning from January 1, 1990. They are Cuba, Romania, Cote d'Ivoire, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and Zaire.

The Security Council bears the main responsibility for the maintenance of internatiional peace and security. The Security Council is authorised to investigate any dispute between states or situations of a similar nature and to recommend procedures or methods of their settlement.

The Security Council may investigate any threat to peace, any violation of peace or act of aggression and decide what measures should be taken.

The Security Council consists of 15 members including five permanent members—the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, the United States, France and Great Britain. In addition to the new non-permanent members elected today, Finland, Canada, Malaysia, Ethiopia, and Colombia will continue to participate in the Security Council for another year.

United States & Canada

Bush Wants CIA Covert Rules Changed

LD2410083989 Moscow TASS in English 0810 GMT 24 Oct 89

[Text] Washington October 24 TASS—By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy:

President George Bush intends to ask the U.S. Congress to introduce changes in the Central Intelligence Agency's covert operations procedures, according to White House officials.

The undisclosed proposals are directly linked to the failed coup attempt in Panama which prompted many lawmakers to berate the Bush administration for failing to help the rebels who tried to topple General Manuel Antonio Noriega.

Responding to criticism, National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft accused critics of petty tutelage of secret service operations.

Meanwhile, President Bush recently told a group of Republican senators that previous congressional limits on secret operations tied the United States during the October 3 coup attempt in Panama, according to the NBC TV network.

The president referred to a ban on the involvement of U.S. agents in plots to assassinate foreign leaders during coups, according to the UPI news agency.

David Boren, chairman of Senate's select committee on intelligence, responded to administration's criticism by promising a prompt and honest discussion of the President's proposals in the committee.

On Monday, White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater, announced that the differences had been settled and that President Bush was satisfied that he and Senator Boren were on the same wavelength.

Fitzwater however, declined to elaborate on possible changes, saying that some intelligence activities should remain secret.

The ban on involvement in assassination attempts will continue, he insisted.

Baker Comments on Soviet Ties, Arms Policy

LD2410085489 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 24 Oct 89

[Text] Washington October 24 TASS—By TASS correspondents Igor Borisenko and Vladimir Matyash:

"Today superpower relations are as promising as we have ever found them since the Second World War." Secretary of State James Baker said on Monday addressing the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco.

The speech, as Baker's recent statement at the Foreign Policy Association in New York, was of a programme character. It dealt mainly with the key problems of Soviet-American relations and contains an exhaustive analysis of the arms control process.

Having noted that the United States face a sober Soviet Union and that Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev "talks of restructuring his society," the U.S. secretary of state dwelt at length on problems of arms control.

He stressed America's desire to move "beyond the peace of armed camps to the peace of shared optimism". The secretary of state said that today there is a chance to carry on "a prudent search for points of mutual advantage."

"Arms control," Baker continued, "can lend a strong hand in building an enduring peace, but arms control does not proceed in a political vacuum." The secretary of state stressed that only by resolving political differences will it be possible to dampen the arms competition. "This is why our times are now so full of promise", he said.

Noting that he and President Bush both wanted "perestroika to succeed," Baker said: "Soviet 'new thinking' in foreign and defence policies promises possibilities that would have been unthinkable a decade ago, such as deep, stabilising cuts in strategic forces and parity in reduced conventional arms in Europe."

Proceeding from this, Baker spelled out the tenets of the Adminstration's arms control policy. "The main goal of arms control," he said, "is to reduce the risk of war—any war, nuclear or conventional. We hope to prevent war by working toward a stable, predictable strategic relationship with the Soviet Union."

He noted that the United States was seeking reductions in first strike surprise attack capabilities.

Touching on the "Star Wars" programme, the secretary of state claimed that it "supports our emphasis on stability. We remain committed to preserving our right to conduct SDI activities consistent with the ABM Treaty." Baker stressed that one of the principles of U.S. policy was to expand the arms control agenda. In this connection he touched on such problems as global arms control, chemical and missile proliferation and also regional conflicts.

"In an increasingly intertwined world, a stable predictable U.S.-Soviet strategic relationship depends in part on regional stability," he said, adding that arms control should increasingly focus on such problems.

"We should be clear about the task ahead," Baker said in conclusion. "We are not on the verge of a perpetual peace in which war is no longer possible. We cannot dis-invent nuclear weapons nor the need for continued deterrence. Nor can we completely eliminate Soviet-American rivalry. But that rivalry does not require that we stand on the brink of Armageddon."

Baker's 'Tone' on Perestroyka Welcomed

PM2310101989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Linnik dispatch: "A Step in the Right Direction. How Washington Regards Perestroyka"]

[Text] New York—The speech by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker to the New York Foreign Policy Association can be considered worthy of note. Not so much because of the essence of the specific initiatives it contains—they actually are rather modest—but in terms of its tone and orientation. Baker's speech clearly and unambiguously formulated U.S. interest in the success of the Soviet Union's perestroyka as a national aim of U.S. foreign policy.

"We have reached this conclusion," Baker said, "not because it is our job to reform Soviet society or keep a specific Soviet leader in power... but because perestroyka promises Soviet actions more advantageous to our interests."

The official U.S. approach to perestroyka has essentially become a mirror image of our own approach. We declared that we launched perestroyka for our own sake rather than out of a desire to please anyone abroad. Now the Americans are also saying that they have decided to back perestroyka, proceeding primarily from their own national interests.

Those interests are obvious to the United States: to establish stable, predictable relations with the Soviet Union based on a considerable reduction in the threat of military confrontation, the primacy of law in international politics, and a readiness to settle regional conflicts. The current administration, which for quite some time skeptically viewed the processes taking place in the USSR as our country's strictly internal affair, has finally realized what we have been saying for a long time now: The fate of peace is inseparable from the fate of our perestroyka.

So what prompted the administration to reach this conclusion? First, statements by its West European allies which impelled the United States to respond to the new quality of Soviet foreign policy. This new quality is beginning to persuade even the most hardened skeptics in the West that the years of perestroyka attest to fundamental changes in the Soviet Union's course in the international arena. Despite the individual calls for vigilance made from time to time in the West (take, for example, the recent warning from NATO Secretary General M. Woerner), the prevailing tone is in favor of responding constructively not simply to the impressive number of Soviet peace initiatives but actually to the radical review of the USSR's goals and tasks.

Second, the administration could no longer ignore the growing criticism inside the country regarding its weak, indecisive line in both domestic and foreign policy. THE WASHINGTON POST recently wrote about (the administration's—V.L.) "frightening inability to define and respond to the emerging problems America is encountering."

Influenced by this criticism to a certain extent, Washington decided to use Baker's speech to clarify its attitude toward one of the central events in world politics at the present stage: perestroyka.

There is reason to believe that the secretary of state's speech will put an end to the discordancy in the chorus of voices assessing perestroyka inside the administration itself. Let us remind ourselves of what was said about the restructuring of Soviet foreign policy quite recently. R. Gates, the president's deputy assistant for national security, has publicly voiced doubts as to the irreversibility and fundamental nature of the changes in the USSR. U.S. Secretary of Defense R. Cheney has predicted failure for those implementing perestroyka in the Soviet Union. Deputy Secretary of State L. Eagleburger announced in nostalgic tones that, under the impact of perestroyka, the "geostrategic stability" which existed in the "cold war" years is being undermined. It is possible that Baker's speech could signal the end of all this confusion—if not in the minds of figures in the Washington administration, then at least in their public appraisals.

A few remarks about the essence of Baker's proposals to give technical assistance to the Soviet Union "in certain areas of Soviet economic reform." As far as one can see, it is a question of consultations with American economists on questions concerning the market, price formation, and enterprises' ability to compete.

Our economist N. Shmelev told me how Baker listened attentively to his 90-minute narrative about the Soviet economy in the aircraft en route to Wyoming for last month's meeting with the Soviet foreign minister. His exchange of opinions on this subject with E.A. Shevardnadze in Jackson Hole persuaded the U.S. secretary of state of the need to put forward his own proposals in the speech delivered to the Foreign Policy Association.

It seems that the U.S. Administration has managed to take a step forward in the main strategic direction—in its conceptualization of the aims of U.S. foreign policy at the present stage. Its essence is that perestroyka in the USSR is in line with U.S. interests.

TASS Notes Space Shuttle Atlantis' Landing

LD2310235389 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 23 TASS—The space shuttle Atlantis with five astronauts on board landed at the Edwards Air Base in California on Monday.

Atlantis blasted off from Cape Canaveral, Florida, on October 18, six days later than scheduled. The flight was delayed because of computer faults and bad weather.

Approximately six and a half hours after take off, the crew put the interplanetary automatic station Galileo into orbit. Galileo will make a six-year trip to Jupiter, the largest plant of the solar system. From there, the station will transmit photos and information about Jupiter to Earth.

During the flight the astronauts conducted several scientific experiments which involved special equipment. They studied changes in the ozone layer, the impact of the state of weightlessness on the human body and the growth of plants.

The astronauts also video taped different regions of earth from space. These materials will be used in a documentary about our planet.

According to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminstration (NASA), Atlantis landed without any complications.

High winds made the mission's director to cut the flight by two revolutions and land the spacecraft earlier than scheduled in favourable weather conditions.

A week after the landing Atlantis will again be carried to Cape Canaveral by a Boeing-747 to prepare for the next flight, scheduled for early February. This mission will be secret and will be held as part of the Pentagon space programme.

Northeast Asia

Sakharov Speaks on Developments in East Europe

OW2310231689 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1200 GMT 23 Oct 89

[From the "NHK News Today" program: Interview in Moscow with Dr Andrey Sakharov, member of the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies, by Hisanori Isomura of NHK; date of interview not given; Isomura asks questions in Japanese and Sakharov answers in Russian, with Japanese subtitles providing translation; following is translated from Japanese—recorded]

[Text] [Video shows closeup shots of Sakharov facing camera throughout the interview]

[Isomura] It appears that perestroyka and glasnost in the Soviet Union are about to change the world. Now what would you say is the situation which is of most concern to you?

[Sakharov] The situation in the Soviet Union has changed much, and there has been a great change since perestroyka started. But reform with respect to commodities for daily living has a long way to go. The fact right now is that only words and theories are moving ahead. Recent strikes in mines are due to differences between the public and the leadership. These strikes in the mines have much meaning since they are an expression of needs of the general public. But essentially the strikes have not been settled, and it is unclear where this move is heading to.

[Isomura] Young people of East Germany are flowing to the West through Hungary, in a sort of exodus. Does this mean that socialism itself has major defects?

[Sakharov] There are many forms of socialism, and I do not know which type of socialism you are thinking of. But it is certain that Stalinist or bureaucratic socialism is not good. The young people of East Germany have shown their objection to the bureaucratic system by fleeing their country. The Soviet people think the same way.

[Isomura] You met with Solidarity Chairman Walesa in Poland last year, and it is said that you yourself promised support to the human rights movement of that country at the time. I would like to hear your view on the question of preservation of human rights.

[Sakharov] The latest moves in Poland and Hungary are for the purpose of reform. This issue has also been raised in the Soviet Union, but the problems the Soviet Union faces are more complex. That is because the country is large in area and problems here broke out rather early. But the people want to have the problems solved. Since East Europe's problems are characteristically international, they need to be solved from the international viewpoint.

Japanese Paper's Criticism of Soviet Policy Hit

PM2010132989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

["Commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA" by TASS Political Observer A. Biryukov: "Slavish Repetition"]

[Text] The Japanese newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN, which reflects the opinion of the country's ruling circles, recently carried an editorial attempting to cast doubt on the Soviet Union's foreign policy and the new political thinking displayed by Moscow. After mentioning in passing that the international situation began to change for the better with M.S. Gorbachev's accession to the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the newspaper emphasized some "reports of actions" which, it said, "run counter" to this development of the situation in the world and "call into question the new thinking" on questions of settling regional conflicts.

Which actions does the newspaper mean? It writes, in particular, that even after the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan the USSR has continued to give military assistance to that country's government. But everyone knows that this assistance has been and is being given on the basis of bilateral Soviet-Afghan agreements. Moreover, the USSR has long urged the other parties to the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan to agree on the mutual cessation by all countries of weapons deliveries to the opposing sides together with a cease-fire under strict international control. It is not the USSR's fault that its appeal does not elicit a response from these other parties, which, violating the Geneva agreements, are stepping up aggression and interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs and delivering large consignments of new, still more deadly weapons to extremist groupings of Afghan rebels—which only helps to prolong the bloodshed in that country.

SANKEI SHIMBUN goes on to allege that "the countries of the East" are "also continuing to give assistance to Nicaragua via Cuba." As though the newspaper did not know that during the talks in Wyoming USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze briefed the Americans on the decision adopted by agreement with the Nicaraguan leadership temporarily to suspend weapons deliveries to that country. And those deliveries were stopped, a fact which was evaluated positively in Washington. The Cuban leadership displayed a similar stand during the Soviet foreign minister's brief visit to Cuba.

The newspaper also writes about some "sharp increase" in Soviet aid to the government of the State of Cambodia. But in this case, too, it makes out that it knows nothing about the fact that Soviet military deliveries to that country are carried out in accordance with existing agreements over a number of years and are of a routine nature. It is known, moreover, that the USSR is nevertheless ready to discuss with all interested sides the question of all states ceasing military deliveries to all Cambodian forces. However, here also, as in the case of Afghanistan, this readiness is not shared by the other side. Have the reports of recent deliveries of large consignments of U.S. arms to antigovernment Khmer groupings and of the training of the Khmer opposition army by U.S. and British instructors really bypassed the Japanese authors?

The impression emerges that the purpose of the editorial article in the Japanese newspaper is very improper—to cast aspersions on the clear policy of the Soviet Union, which consistently advocates the all-embracing political settlement of regional conflicts on the basis of broad national reconciliation. And this is what you also sense in reading this article: It does not express its own original opinion but repeats what was said by those with no interest in the speediest resolution of the conflicts which are aggravating the international situation.

Japan Seen Hiding 'Realism' of 1950's Leaders

PM2410101189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Igor Latyshev "Correspondent's Commentary": "Under Lock and Key"]

[Text] Tokyo, 23 Oct—The Japanese Foreign Ministry published a few days ago a series of archive documents on Japan's foreign policy in 1952-1958. The publication of such documents, hitherto classified as secret, occurs periodically in Japan in line with a decision made by the Japanese Government some time ago whereby diplomatic archives are made public after 30 years.

But an initial study of the published archive material has disappointed Japanese journalists and scientists. They actually expressed dissatisfaction. It appeared that Japan's Foreign Ministry had not taken proper care to ensure that the Japanese people were given full information on Japanese diplomats' activity in the early and mid-fifties. This information had not been publicized hitherto owing to various political considerations. Rather the contrary. In the opinion of scientists and journalists, the decisions by ministry leaders who selected the documents for publication clearly display a desire to limit themselves to half-truths. Any documents dating back 30 or more years which could cast light—considered undesirable by Japanese diplomacy—on facts and events of the time are still kept a secret from the people as a so-called "exception to the general rule." Local commentators especially noticed the fact that the published archive material contains almost none of the documents associated with the Japanese-Soviet talks in 1955-1956 which preceded the signing of the joint Soviet-Japanese declaration on normalizing relations between the two countries.

Expressing disagreement editorially with the blatantly selective method of publishing archive documents, the newspaper MAINICHI unambiguously accuses the leaders of Japan's Foreign Ministry of intending, despite the expiry of the 30-year period, to keep secret from the public many documents dating back to the early and mid-fifties, above all those concerning Japan's relations with the Soviet Union. A commentary by Professor M. Asai of Tokyo University, published by the newspaper ASAHI, is couched in similar terms.

But criticism by the press and by scientific circles is hardly likely to change anything. After all, the unwillingness of the leadership of Japan's Foreign Ministry to inform the public of all the circumstances surrounding the Soviet-Japanese talks held in the mid-fifties clearly displays its lack of confidence in the consistency and permanence of the positions taken by Japanese diplomacy at that time on disputed questions concerning the normalization of relations between the two countries. The Foreign Ministry archivists' silence and their refusal to publish the most important documents of the time indicate more eloquently than any specific statement that nowadays the leaders of Japan's Foreign Ministry find it disadvantageous to present an objective picture of the past. It is, after all, well known that many Japanese statesmen and politicians in the fifties displayed more realism and flexibility in talks with the Soviet Union than is being displayed at present, that they considered the possibility of solutions to disputed questions which are deemed unacceptable by the current leaders of Japan's foreign policy.

The line of keeping silent about individual historical facts and publicizing them on a selective basis is shortsighted. Sooner or later, all details of the past will surface and the broad Japanese public will, one way or another, discover the contents of documents which, despite the expiry of the time period, are still being kept under lock and key by overvigilant functionaries at Japan's Foreign Ministry.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Call for Pacific Naval Arms Control Talks Noted

BK2110092989 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0500 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Text] The Soviet Union has reiterated a call for East-West talks on naval arms control in the Pacific. A senior Soviet foreign policy planner, Mr. Vladimir (Kolargen), made the call in a speech in the New Zealand capital Wellington.

Mr. (Kolargen) described as very bright the prospects for arms reductions agreements between the superpowers on chemical, strategic, and conventional weapons in Europe.

He said that in such circumstances, it was very disturbing that there was no program on arms reduction, especially naval, in the Pacific.

Mr. (Kolargen) said United States wanted to maintain a clear-cut superiority in naval forces to counter Soviet superiority in land forces. And he said that, with the prospect of Soviet land superiority being reduced as a result of current arms control talks, American naval superiority in the Pacific was becoming strategically intolerable.

The New Zealand Press Association says previous Soviet calls for Pacific naval arms talks have been largely unanswered by the West.

U.S. 'Propaganda Campaign' Seen in Philippines

HK2410040589 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 23 oct 89

[Text] The United States has launched a propaganda campaign to allow it to retain its military bases in the Philippines. In this connection, the U.S. labor attache in the Philippines (James Dodd) has declared that if the U.S. military bases, Clark Air Base, and Subic Naval Base, are dismantled, 68,000 Filipino workers will be adversely affected.

On the other hand, analysts are saying that many Filipinos today believe that the continued presence of these bases will only serve as a magnet, should a nuclear war break out, thus threatening the security of the Philippines.

The present agreement governing the American military bases in the country is scheduled to end in 1991. Two-thirds of the members of the Philippine Senate are opposed to retaining the bases.

Council of Ministers Condolences on SRV Typhoon

LD2210020289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1020 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 October, (TASS)—The USSR Council of Ministers has sent a telegram to Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, which expresses sincere condolences to the government and people of the socialist Republic of Vietnam in connection with the losses of life and destruction caused by a typhoon in the provinces of Nge Tinh, Guang Ninh, and Thanh Hoa, and in a number of other regions of central Vietnam. The telegram requests that deep condolences be conveyed to the friends and relatives of the victims.

Education Agreement With Vietnam Signed

LD2110141989 Moscow TASS International Service Russian 0903 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Excerpt] Hanoi, 21 Oct (TASS)—A new Soviet-Vietnamese agreement on cooperation in the sphere of education was signed here on Friday. It provides for further improvement in the training of specialists for Vietnam's national economy, the rendering of practical help in the creation of a preschool education system, and expansion of links in the sphere of social sciences and the teaching of the Russian and Vietnamese languages.

The agreement was the result of a visit to Vietnam by a delegation of the USSR State Committee for Public Education, headed by its chairman G.A. Yagodin. [passage omitted]

Near East & South Asia

Rafsanjani Gives News Conference in Tehran

LD2310193489 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Tehran October 23 TASS—By TASS correspondent Ravil Musin:

President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani of the Islamic Republic of Iran gave a news conference here today. The president mainly discussed economic issues facing Iran and some international issues, including his view about the settlement in Afghanistan.

Commenting on the practical implementation of the accords reached during his official visit to the Soviet Union in June of this year and on perspectives of strengthening good-neighbourly relations between the Soviet Union and Iran, Rafsanjani stated:

"During my talks with Mr. Gorbachev we were able to discuss all issues of concern to us. We achieved full mutual understanding on our bilateral relations, the situation in the region, and some other international issues.

"The agreements reached in Moscow are now being successfully translated into life. A Soviet delegation is presently visiting Tehran. Another delegation will arrive in a few days. They will consider concrete programmes of cooperation between the two countries.

"I consider the prospects for developing relations between the Soviet Union and Iran to be most favourable and satisfactory," Rafsanjani stressed.

Speaking about relations with Iraq, the president noted that the present state of "neither peace, nor war" did not meet the interests of either country and must be changed sooner or later.

Turning to the Afghan issue, Rafsanjani pointed to the need to involve all Afghanistan's neighbours in the solution—Iran, Pakistan, the Soviet Union, India and China.

The United Nations can also contribute to the resolution of the issue, the Iranian president said.

Rafsanjani spoke out for the development of cooperation with Western countries. The conditions for this, he said, are noninterference in each other's affairs and mutual respect.

At the same time, the president stressed that the United States is obviously occupying a hostile position vis-a-vis Iran.

Ministers To Visit Iran in December

LD2410083789 Tehran IRNA in English 0820 GMT 24 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 24, IRNA—Three Soviet ministers are expected to visit Iran in December, said Soviet minister of railways who is also the co-chairman of Irano-Soviet Joint Economic Commission Nikolay Konarev here Monday.

Konarev is to accompany Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev and Minister of Heavy and Transport Machine Building Vladimir Velichko.

Konarev announced this in a meeting with Iranian Ambassador to Moscow Nasir Heyrani Nobari.

During the meeting, Konarev said that the last June visit to Moscow of President Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani's was a "historical and significant turning point" in Tehran-Moscow relations.

"The Soviet Union is ready to do all it can to carry out the agreements reached between the two countries last June," he said describing the forthcoming visit is an step in this direction.

Konarev also expressed the hope that the 12th session of the joint economic commission will be held in Tehran in December.

Expansion of Iran's Tourism Industry Viewed

NC2010113689 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 19 Oct 89

[Interview with commentator Aleksandr Batyev by unidentified announcer from the "On the Waves of Radio Moscow" feature—recorded; Batyev speaks in Russian fading into Persian translation]

[Text] [Announcer] Mr 'Abd-Khoda'i, head of Iran's Tourism Office affiliated to the Education Ministry, recently announced that Iran intends to open its borders to foreign tourists. He pointed out that this will help both in improving understanding among nations and in attracting additional foreign exchange.

[Batyev] The Iranian official's announcement shows that the new Iranian Government is prepared to use nontraditional methods to promote the country's economic growth. Iran's income from tourism during the next 5 years is expected to be about $500 million.

[Announcer] How realistic is this figure?

[Batyev] I think that this figure is very realistic. If we divide $500 million by 5, then we see that it is a relatively small amount for each year. Actually this figure does not satisfy Mr 'Abd-Khoda'i, who believes that it is far below Iran's potential. After all, the historic monuments of Iran's ancient civilization should draw tourists like a magnet. Money will have to be allocated for the reconstruction of existing hotels or the construction of new ones. Tourism has declined in recent years, mainly as a result of the Iran-Iraq war.

[Announcer] Despite this, I think that there are many people in the world who are interested in seeing rare and unique phenomena and are very willing to forego a high standard of comfort to see Iran's historic monuments.

[Batyev] There are other types of obstacles that should be removed. First of all we know that foreign tourists did not receive special treatment in Iran in the past. Moreover, there were certain ideas in the West, but not only in the West, against Iran's Islamic revolution. We need only recall the commotion over the so-called Rushdie affair. Both sides need to make the necessary effort to remove these obstacles. Much will depend on the state of Iran's relations with the outside world. It seems that Iran is now paying more attention to the outside world. We need only recall Mr 'Abd-Khoda'i's statement that his country will open its borders to foreign tourists to improve understanding among nations.

Renewed Export of Iranian Gas to USSR Noted

TA2010184489 Moscow in Dari to Afghanistan 1500 GMT 20 Oct 89

[Igor Sheftunov commentary in "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Dear listeners: A Soviet economic delegation headed by Soviet Deputy Minister of Foreign Economic

Relations Vladimir Mordvinov arrived in Tehran. Our commentator Igor Sheftunov has written the following:

This delegation will be holding final talks over an agreement according to which export of Iranian gas to the Soviet Union will begin as of next year. Export of Iranian gas was envisaged in the long-term Soviet-Iranian cooperation program that was concluded last June in Moscow by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Iranian President Hashemi-Rafsanjani. It should be noted that special attention is attached to Soviet-Iranian cooperation in the sphere of gas among the 15 most important economic fields included in this program. In real practical terms, it has also been shown to what extent cooperation in this sphere is beneficial to both our countries. The export of Iranian gas to the Soviet Union through (?a pipeline) built with Soviet assistance began 19 years ago.

In return for the export of Iranian gas, the Soviet Union has aided Iran in the construction of many important industrial projects, including the Esfahan steel mill, the Arak machine factory, the power stations of Ahvaz and Esfahan, and scores of silos and other institutions.

The Iran-Iraq war prevented further expansion of this mutually beneficial cooperation. After the declaration of a cease-fire on the Iran-Iraq front last year, however, conditions became ripe for the restoration of all-out Soviet-Iranian commercial relations. The long-term program concluded this summer is clear proof that both countries desire to launch and develop widespread cooperation. The renewed export of Iranian gas to the Soviet Union as of next year, the volume of which at the outset will amount to 2 billion cubic meters and one year later will reach 3 billion cubic meters, will render Soviet-Iranian cooperation a permanent and solid aspect.

The Soviet Union will compensate for the gas export and will assist Iran in the development of the most important economic fields, such as energy, metal fusion, machinery, and transport. After arriving in Tehran, Vladimir Mordvinov said that these issues will be discussed at the current talks in the Iranian capital. Such cooperation will have a positive effect on Iran's financial situation because it will decrease this country's need for foreign loans.

The renewed export of Iranian gas to the Soviet Union also envisages the use of Soviet territory for the export of Iranian gas to European countries. Iran has signed long-term agreements with some of these countries. For example, one billion cubic meters of gas will be exported annually over 20 years to (?Czechoslovakia). Agreement has also been reached for the export of Iranian gas to Poland.

Renewed Soviet-Iranian cooperation in the field of gas is regarded as an important step in the development of mutually beneficial trade relations between the neighboring countries.

Road Opened from Soviet Border to Afghan Interior

LD2310194189 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Kabul October 23 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Greshnov:

The road connecting the administrative centre of the Gerat Province with the northern border checkpoint of Turgundi has been opened for motor traffic.

Truck convoys carrying foodstuffs and other vital goods can now travel unhindered from the Soviet border into Afghanistan's interior.

This was announced by Rais Djalandar, the commander of an armed formation which recently crossed over to the government side.

"Some time ago," he said, "my unit numbering 900 men joined the process of national reconciliation and pledged to protect this strategically important road.

"The population of Gerat and outlying villages can no longer complain of food shortages. The prices on foodstuffs testify to the improved situation, too. They are several times below those in other major cities."

Reports from the Lagman Province say that a major ammunition and armaments storage belonging to the anti-government force "The Movement of Afghanistan's Islamic Revolution" was blown up there.

The explosion destroyed a considerable number of "surface-to- surface" missiles, big-caliber machine-guns and other arms.

In the past 24 hours, clashes between forces of the Islamic Society of Afghanistan and the Islamic Party of Afghanistan claimed dozens of lives and left more wounded or injured.

The Afghan Foreign Ministry handed four official notes to the U.N. Good Offices Mission, stating that Pakistan keeps inciting bloodshed and fratricidal strife on the Afghan soil by providing newest missiles to the irreconcilable opposition, which uses them to bombard cities and other major population centres.

Afghan Rebels' New Tactics Analyzed

PM2310141189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by M. Yusin: "Afghanistan: Mujahiddin's Tactics Change"]

[Text] In the past few days the news agency teleprinters have increasingly rarely been bringing reports from the fronts of the Afghan war. The predictions are being confirmed of those experts who expected a decline in the mujahiddin's military activeness as the cold weather approaches. It is true that the "fighting season" has not yet ended in Afghanistan: It will be at least a month before the snow encumbers the mountain passes making it impossible to carry out large-scale operations. But it is becoming increasingly obvious that the opposition detachments are not even thinking of such operations. The mujahiddin are limiting themselves to rocket fire on Kabul, to attacks on motor convoys, and to small battles with the defenders of the blockaded cities. It is not out of the question that the relative lull which has been established in the majority of regions of the country will continue until spring. The regime's opponents have come to terms with the fact that they will not succeed this year in winning substantial victories over the government Army.

In a recent talk with a correspondent of the French magazine L'EXPRESS, one of the opposition's most famous "field commanders," Ahmad Shah Mas'ud, revealed the thrust of the new tactics which the mujahiddin have adopted. He confirmed that for a little while now his detachments have been deliberately avoiding large battles with Najibullah's army, preferring surprise guerrilla attacks. "Our aim is to wear down the enemy, not to give him a minute's rest, to attack him in different places simultaneously, to deliver small but painful pricks, to force him to dissipate his forces to defend communications, thus making the cities vulnerable."

According to Mas'ud, since the recent defeats at Jalalabad and Khowst the ideas of storming reinforced cities are no longer popular with the opposition commanders: "We will begin a large battle only if we are 90 percent certain of its successful outcome."

The gamble will now be on a dense blockade of the cities. As a result garrisons which receive neither provisions nor ammunition will, according to Mas'ud's calculations, capitulate without special efforts from the besiegers. But even the French magazine correspondent is not inclined to share the optimism of his interlocutor, recalling that the numerical strength of Mas'ud's army (the mujahiddin's largest combat formation) is no more than 9,000 men while Najibullah, according to L'EXPRESS, has up to 400,000 soldiers...

In conclusion, a few words about the situation on the fronts. In their military dispatches the agencies devote most attention to the situation in the Khowst region. It is reported that a large motor convoy (up to 200 vehicles) with food and ammunition for the besieged garrison has left Kabul under tank escort. This is the first attempt since January 1988 to break through to Khowst by land. Before that the city has been supplied only by air. Seeking to impede the convoy's advance, the mujahiddin are organizing ambushes every day. The convoy is overcoming every kilometer with fierce fighting. Nonetheless according to reports from Kabul a considerable proportion of the 200-kilometer route between the capital and Khowst has already been travelled.

In the Jalalabad region fighting is continuing for control of the highway linking that city with Kabul. The mujahiddin have made their latest attempt to cut off the road and they succeeded in briefly establishing control over several dominant heights making it possible to shell a considerable part of the highway. Government troops using tanks, missiles, and aircraft, shifted to a counterattack and drove the enemy from the positions he had seized. But according to an AFP report, despite this success the road remains blocked and aid for Jalalabad's defenders can only be airlifted.

Pakistan Aiding Afghan Rebels' Drug Activities

LD2310130389 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

Drug trafficking has become a component part of the brutal war waged by Afghan rebels against their own people. Afghan areas controlled by the opposition now produce about 800 tonnes (and to other estimates even much more) of opium annually.

There are over 200 underground factories in Pakistan processing opium from the rebels. One of the world's largest factories producing heroin is owned by the Islamic Party of Afghanistan (IPA) led by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar.

But drug trafficking is practiced not only by the IPA. The struggle for zones of influence and the main routes of drug smuggling are a reason for fratricidal clashes between rebels, the number of which has grown in the recent past.

Fierce skirmishes along the Afghan-Pakistani border take place between detachments of the Islamic Revolution Movement of Afghanistan and the Islamic Union of the Liberation of Afghanistan to control three river bridges over which opium poppies are shipped to laboratories. Specialists note that drug dealers use the same channels to bring opium to Pakistan which are employed to carry weapons to Afgan areas controlled by rebels.

Soviet diplomatic circles believe that the support given by some countries to the Pakistani-based "interim government", in actual fact, helps drug barons step up their operations.

The most favoured treatment granted by some forces to Afghan rebels who skim huge profits from drug dealing, looks very strange against the background of world-wide efforts to control drug trafficking in other parts of the globe.

Peace in Afghanistan is the only way of stopping the production and smuggling of narcotics from the Afghan-Pakistani border area. And the only way to achieve peace is to form a coalition government representing the interests of all Afhan political forces and the entire people of this much-suffering country, Soviet diplomatic circles believe.

Afghan Complaint on Road Attacks, UN Aid Cited

PM2310113589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Afghan Government Statement"]

[Text] Kabul, 20 Oct—According to reliable information in the possession of the Afghan Ministry of State Security, field commanders from Ahmad Shah Mas'ud's "Islamic Society of Afghanistan" and Sufi Payyand's [name as published] "Islamic Party of Afghanistan," as well as a number of other ringleaders of insurgent detachments have been ordered to close sections of the Kabul-Hayratan Highway, an Afghan Government statement disseminated today by BAKHTAR states. The insurgents' planned actions are aimed at stopping UN convoys of food and essentials, shipped to Afghanistan from Finland within the framework of the "Operation Salam" humanitarian and economic aid programs, from reaching the Afghan capital. In a number of areas adjoining the highway, there are concentrations of large groups of insurgents belonging to the "Alliance of Seven," whose activities are coordinated by military advisers from Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

The irresponsible actions inspired by the Pakistani military, the document stresses, are directly aimed against the humanitarian aid being sent by the world community to Afghanistan.

The statement notes with profound regret that Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto is not only informed about the subversive actions planned by the Pakistani military, but is actually abetting them.

The Afghan Government has information that a UN organization has given Ahmad Shah Mas'ud large sums of money, supposedly to provide for the population in the regions under his formations' control.

The Afghan Government intends asking UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar the reason why that organization distributed UN aid intended for the civilian population through persons who are fighting both against the Afghan Government and directly against the international community, and placing UN convoys and the lives of UN employees in jeopardy.

Saudi 'Spy' Sentenced to 20 Years in Afghanistan

LD2210170189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1525 GMT 22 Oct 89

[Text] Kabul, 22 Oct (TASS)—A session of the extraordinary State Security Court of Afghanistan took place in the Afghan capital today, to examine the case of the Saudi Arabian citizen Husam al-Din Mahmud. The court found Mahmud guilty of illegally crossing the border of the Republic of Afghanistan as part of a bandit group, and of armed struggle against the Afghan government. The accused was found to have taken part in the activities of the secret service of Saudi Arabia.

The court sentenced Husam al-Din Mahmud to 20 years deprivation of freedom.

Saudi Arabia Congratulated on Proclamation Day

LD2210014889 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 21 TASS—The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and king of Saudi Arabia Fahd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Aziz al Sa'ud exchanged messages on the occasion of the national holiday of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia—the Proclamation Day.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in its message conveyed kind wishes to the Saudi people and personally the king.

The king of Saudi Arabia in his reply messaged expressed profound gratitude for the congratulations and wished happiness and health to Mikhail Gorbachev, further progress and prosperity to the Soviet people.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopian Leader's Unity Appeal Cited

PM2310155989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by G. Ustinov: "Ethiopia: Nation in Danger]

[Text] Addis Ababa—Citizens of Ethiopia have been following the events developing in the north of the country with alarm for around 2 months now.

At the end of August armed groupings of the Tigre People's Liberation Front [TPLF] launched active combat operations there against government troops. They took the strategic province as a result of a major offensive, cutting Addis Ababa off from Eritrea and the seaport of Massawa—through which a considerable amount of vitally important freight enters Ethiopia.

As it continues to fight the republic army, the TPLF is extending its influence over the neighboring Provinces of Welo, Gojam, and Gonder. Fighting is taking place on roughly one-third of Ethiopian territory.

On Wednesday evening Mengistu Haile Mariam, president of the country and general secretary of the Workers Party of Ethiopia, made a national television address. He urged the Ethiopian people to defend Ethiopia's unity and deliver a final and irrevocably crushing defeat on the forces seeking to dismember it. The traitors to the nation united beneath the TPLF flag, the president stressed, are acting in concert with the Eritrean separatists, serving as their direct accomplices. The country's unity is in extreme danger, Mengistu Haile Mariam stated in his television appeal to the nation.

Until quite recently, the president reminded listeners, the talks between the government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, held in Atlanta, had instilled in the Ethiopian people a hope that a political settlement of the protracted Eritrean conflict might be possible. However, the self-styled Tigre People's Liberation Front had struck a blow against the peace settlement at that crucial moment. And it had done so when the conditions had emerged for that organization to participate in the talks. There is no doubt that the TPLF leaders are guided by narrow, nationalistic interests and are trying to set Ethiopians against Ethiopians. It is the task and responsibility of true patriots, the president said, to expose this conspiracy and uphold the nation's territorial integrity.

He went on to observe that all the conditions necessary for a democratic solution of political problems had been created during the 15 years of revolutionary development in the country. Those endeavoring to solve this complicated issue by military means had no justification whatever. Lebanon illustrates where this can lead.

The president concluded his television address by saying that the Ethiopian Government's desire for peace is clearly being seen as a weakness. The patience of the country's leadership is near its end. The Ethiopian people are faced with the choice of assenting to the separation of Eritrea and the disintegration of the remaining part of the republic or mobilizing all available potential to achieve a final strategic victory. We expect a prompt decision by the people, the president said.

Ethiopian Talks on 'Brink of Disruption'

EA2310191489 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 21 Oct 89

[From The "East Africa Last Week" program]

[Text] The week just ending has been of great concern to Ethiopia. The so-called Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF], the second biggest of similar fronts in action in the country, has been carrying out intensified military operations. Last Wednesday [18 October] President Mengistu Haile Mariam addressed the nation on TV in connection with the difficult situation in the country. He called on the people to crush the forces working to disunite the country, noting that the TPLF was the direct agent of the Eritrean secessionists.

It will be recalled that an agreement was reached to start peace talks between the Ethiopian Government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front in Nairobi, Kenya, next month. However, the TPLF's escalated activities could impede the Nairobi talks. In this respect, it could be said that the efforts initiated to resolve the Eritrean problem peacefully are on the brink of disruption. AP reported from Nairobi in midweek that following a series of contacts in London, agreement in principle had been reached between the TPLF and the Ethiopian Government on holding peace talks. The Front, however has said that the fighting will continue until the talks start. Meanwhile, the Ethiopian Government has so far said nothing on the possibility of starting the talks.

CPSU Delegation Returns From Ethiopia

PM2310132589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Return"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by G.M. Khodyrev, first secretary of Gorkiy Oblast CPSU Committee, returned 20 October to Moscow from the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, which it visited within the framework of interparty ties.

East Europe

Akhromeyev: Warsaw Pact 'Alliance of Interests'

AU2310162089 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1300 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] The adviser to Mikhail Gorbachev, Sergey Akhromeyev, has pleaded that we regard the Warsaw Pact and NATO rather as alliances of interest, and not so much from an ideological point of view. In an interview with GDR radio, Akhromeyev referred to the recent Bucharest meeting, in which the heads of state of the Warsaw Treaty expressed their support for politicalizing the two alliances. It was argued that, in the future, existing contradictions can be solved only through political means. In this context it is almost a matter of course that Army General Lobov, chief of staff, appeared at the North Atlantic assembly in Rome, as did NATO's commander in chief for Europe, General Galvin, he said.

Asked about dangers to the unity of the Warsaw Pact as a consequence of the developments in Hungary and Poland, the adviser to Gorbachev reiterated the character of the alliance of interests. One has become all too accustomed to the fact that all of these countries are socialist. Yet, 45 years have elapsed since the victory of the allies in World War II. The world system of the postwar era is changing, he said, adding that he does not believe that the interests of the states united in the Warsaw Pact would ever change.

Shevardnadze Arrives in Warsaw 24 Oct

LD2410101489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0940 GMT 24 Oct 89

[Text] Warsaw, 24 Oct, (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, arrived in Warsaw today.

He was met at the airport by K. Skubiszewski, minister of foreign affairs of the Polish People's Republic, and other officials. V.I. Brovikov, USSR ambassador to Poland, was in the reception party.

Solidarity, PZPR Clash at Sosnowiec Mine Worsens

PM2310100189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Worsening of Situation"]

[Text] TRYBUNA LUDU has announced the worsening of the situation at the "Kazimierz-Juliusz" Mine in the Silesian city of Sosnowiec, where the party committee was closed down at the enterprise under pressure from a "Solidarity" cell. Several rounds of talks between representatives of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] and the trade union regarding the transfer of the party committee from the administrative block to different premises were to no avail.

At a recent meeting "Solidarity" leaders said that they would not agree to the party committee being housed in any building belonging to the enterprise.

This stance by "Solidarity" fundamentally changed the situation at the talks. The party committee secretary said that, given this approach, further talks with "Solidarity" seem pointless.

In response to these words, Marek Januszko, leader of the "Solidarity" trade union organization's auditing commission at the mine, insulted the participants in the meeting.

This Wednesday the situation at the "Kazimierz-Juliusz" Mine deteriorated still further. That morning en route for work a certain Marek Z.—a member of the plant "Solidarity" committee—beat up Zbigniew Wengler, chairman of the party committee's control and auditing commission at the mine and delegate to the 10th PZPR Congress.

Hungary Experiencing 'Responsible Stage'

LD2310130589 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Thirty-three years have passed since the tragic events in Hungary in autumn 1956. Until recently the events have been interpreted at official level as a counterrevolutionary mutiny which reactionary groups staged, banking on the mistakes that had been made in socialist development. The mutiny was suppressed with the help of Soviet troops. Its leaders were tried and executed. But the events have got new assessments this year. It was said, in particular, that the 1956 popular uprising was aimed against Stalin's model of barrack-type socialism at first, and extremists ultimately developed it into a mutiny. The remains of Imre Nagy, the leader of the uprising, were reburied in Budapest last June in a solemn atmosphere, and an amnesty was declared for all those who were prosecuted for participation in the 1956 events.

The opposition recently demanded in parliament declaring 23d October a national holiday, but MPs rejected the idea by a majority vote and suggested marking a national reconciliation day. A funeral service for the dead will be held in Budapest's main cathedral, and in the afternoon columns of people will stream from various places in the capital toward the building of Parliament to take part in a meeting there. At the meeting the chairman of the National Assembly will officially announce that from now on the country will be called a Hungarian Republic. The National Assembly adopted the decision after approving the number of far-reaching constitutional amendments. It described the Hungarian Republic as an independent and democratic state that recognized the values of both democratic socialism and bourgeois democracy. Early this month the governing party was transformed at an extraordinary congress into a Hungarian socialist one. The party proclaimed the aim of peaceful moving from what it called dictatorial state socialism to democratic socialism based on a market economy. As we can see, Hungary is living through a responsible stage of its history.

Szuros Cited on Renaming of Hungarian Republic

LD2310163689 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Budapest October 23 TASS—In accordance with the new text of the Constitution recently adopted, Hungary was proclaimed a republic in a ceremony here today.

Speaking from the balcony of the Hungarian parliamentary building, acting president Matyas Szuros, president of Hungary's National Assembly, declared that as of October 23 the nation's name is the Republic of Hungary.

Szuros said that the proclamation of the republic is a fresh step along the road of democratic changes. "We are striving for a state where the values of bourgeois democracy and democratic socialism are equally valid", he said.

Szuros said that the Republic of Hungary is trying to develop ties with Eastern and Western states, promoting the unification of Europe, the consolidation of its security and the solution of global problems.

"We still believe that unhampered and balanced development of ties with our great neighbour, the Soviet Union, suits Hungary's national interests," he said.

"At the same time we are striving to develop cooperation with the other great power, the United States. Guided by our supreme national interests, we support good relations with neighbouring countries," the speaker said.

The state flag of Hungary was hoisted. A guard of honour was called to attention. Members of the cabinet, representatives of the Hungarian Socialist Party, of opposition parties and organisations were present.

Hungarian Party Law Debate Reported

PM2310131789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent F. Lukyanov: "Hungary: Basis of Multiparty System"]

[Text] Budapest—The draft law on parties, first submitted for the verdict of the Hungarian public back in April this year, has had a complex destiny. Twice now it has appeared on the agenda of a State Assembly session and then been removed and reworked before finally being approved by the present, October, session of parliament.

The law (its final name is the law on the activity and economic management of parties), called on to regulate all aspects of the parties' political activity, was adopted at a moment when a multiparty system has essentially already formed in the country. In addition to the ruling Hungarian Socialist Party about 15 political parties of absolutely different orientations are now operating in Hungary.

If you compare the initial text of the draft law (IZVESTIYA has provided its readers with quite detailed information about it) and the one which lay on the deputies' tables, very, very substantial differences can be noted whose aim is the liberalization of the procedure for the creation and activity of parties. For instance, the initial version stipulated that to found a party it is necessary to have 1,000 constituent members, which generated sharp protest from the opposition. In the new text of the draft the number of constituent members is not stipulated at all, that is a party can be created by three or five people. Perhaps it was this which served as the pretext for one Hungarian newspaper to show a drawing of three people talking on the street, which allowed a fourth person to suggest that they create a party... However that may be, many restrictions have "departed" from the final text of the law.

Instead of this, a prominent place has been taken by clauses regulating the economic and financial activity of parties, which in the future will have to report literally down to the last forint the size of their assets and the sources of their revenue to the state report chamber [uchetnaya palata] which has now been created.

But nonetheless, perhaps the most perceptible new element during the working up of the draft law and during its adoption at the session was the question of the parties' activity at work places. There was no unity on this question either at the "roundtable" talks with the opposition or in the ranks of the former Hungarian Socialist Workers Party itself, whose activity until recently was built on the production principle, that is at work places. The deputies were offered a choice of two versions of the relevant article of the law. The first permitted the activity of all parties at work places in the future, the second provided for the parties' gradual withdrawal (of course it is mainly a question of the Hungarian Socialist Party) by the end of this year from the organs of state power, the Armed Forces and the police, and from all other work places by the end of next year.

After lively debates the deputies voted for the option which does not allow the activity of parties at work places in the future, thus closing a question which has long been debated.

And so the law on the activity and economic management of parties enters into force. The transfer to the multiparty system proclaimed at the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Central Committee February (1989) receives a legal basis. Now the main thing, as deputy F. Kallai, the well known Hungarian actor, said in his speech at the session, is that the multiparty system should not be reduced to a struggle for power among various parties but should serve the interests of the nation, the interests of people.

Passions Run High Over Hungarian Election

PM2310112189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch: "Who Will Be Elected President?"]

[Text] Budapest, 21 Oct—Union of Free Democrats [MFD] representatives are distributing leaflets and collecting signatures in subway passages and parking lots. Their demand is that the president of the Hungarian Republic be elected by the deputies of the new parliament. Some 140,000 signatures have already been collected. The petitions have been presented to M. Szuros, president of the Hungarian Republic's National Assembly. The lists are being checked right now. Computers and some 40 "monitors" are due to complete this work in the presence of an MDF representative within 30 days.

Meanwhile, passions are boiling up over the presidential election.

The recent congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP]-Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] confirmed I. Poszgay as the MSZP's presidential candidate. In the MSZP's opinion, these elections ought to be held in the next few months, before the parliamentary general election. The Patriotic People's Front nominated K. Kulcsar as its candidate at its congress held a few days ago. He is the present minister of justice. The MFD nominated its own candidate. The Smallholders' Party nominated Otto von Habsburg, son of the last Austro-Hungarian emperor, for this position. But the 76-year old European Parliament deputy refused—"for the time being, in any event," as he put it. The October Party (named after the October 1956 events) proposed voting for S. Racz. He headed the workers' councils movement in 1956. The name of Parliamentary Deputy Z. Kiraly became known in the country a short while ago. This young and energetic deputy from Szeged City was expelled from the MSZMP for links with the opposition. He has been nominated as presidential candidate by the social democrats.

Some people have described the collection of "autographs" in subway passages as a manipulation.

The "bombshell," loaded with names, demands, tactical and strategic moves, and slogans, exploded at the Hungarian Republic's National Assembly session which has just ended. It was even proposed to postpone altogether any decision on holding the presidential election. But since the signatures have been collected, a referendum seems possible.

Political Changes in GDR Discussed

PM2310104789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Lapskiy: "GDR These Days"]

[Text] Berlin—Very little time has elapsed since the ninth Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Plenum which proclaimed the party course toward changes, but they are already being felt. They are noticeable primarily on the pages of newspapers and the television screens: Items have become franker, and what really concerns people and which only some 5 days ago the mass media flatly refused to notice, so to speak, has emerged to the fore.

There are reports of meetings of the leaders of the local organs of power with representatives of the public in many of the republic's cities. Guenter Schabowski, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Berlin Bezirk party committee, met with the capital's construction workers. He was asked: Should the dialogue mentioned in Egon Krenz' speech not be viewed merely as a temporary step taken by the party under public pressure? Pressure and dialogue, G. Schabowski said, are mutually exclusive, pressure and ultimatums are methods which make dialogue pointless. Dialogue requires glasnost, honesty, commitment, and mutual respect. If the party is embarking today on a broad discussion with all social forces and primarily with the working class, then it is solely because this is required by the present degree of maturity of socialism in the GDR. Renewal is inconceivable without citizens' knowledge and abilities, without their idea of the future.

Party aktiv meetings have been held in several bezirks [areas]. H. Modrow, first secretary of the Dresden Bezirk party committee, stressed in his speech that the situation which has taken shape in the country requires profound changes in whose implementation all classes and social strata, young people, and believers should take part. Here it is essential to use the experience accumulated by the Soviet Union. The dialogue which has been begun must not become "bogged down" in the discussion of contradictions, it must help find correct decisions and show the way out of the situation which has taken shape.

The boards of the GDR's creative unions have also been in session these days. The participants in these meetings expressed themselves in favor of profound changes in information and cultural policy. The sitting of the presidium of the film and television specialists association stressed that the mass media must take immediate steps to regain their lost trust. It is a case of turning them into a rostrum for dialogue between all social forces. Those taking part in the sitting demanded the creation of a "television approved by the people," "the unimpeded showing of Soviet films in the country's best movie theaters," "the resumption of the distribution in the GDR of the Soviet journal SPUTNIK in German which was banned here last year, and the showing of the Soviet film 'Repentance,' which has been shelved here." (Today's Berlin newspapers publish an announcement from the GDR Ministry of Post and Telecommunications that the distribution of SPUTNIK is being resumed in the republic).

On Friday evening Wolfgang Meyer, director of the Foreign Ministry Press Department, appeared on a GDR television channel to answer a correspondent's questions. Meyer announced that it has been decided to allow the GDR citizens on the territory of the FRG Embassy in Warsaw to emigrate to the West. This decision, of a temporary nature, has been taken out of humane considerations. The GDR Embassy in Poland will engage in registering the departures. To the correspondent's question "but what if citizens decide to return to the GDR?" he replied that assistance will be rendered to them to the extent of the GDR's powers and potential. According to unofficial reports, there are already several thousand people who want to return. I want to recall that the GDR Government has embarked on the elaboration of new provisions for citizens' emigration abroad.

The changes have also affected the army. It has been announced that as of 1 December this year the living and daily routine conditions of servicemen in the GDR National People's Army will be improved. A Defense Ministry spokesman announced that reworked rules for internal service and the granting of leave will come into force. For instance, soldiers on active service to draftees of the reserve service, with the permission of their unit commander, will be able to travel to the barracks in their own automobile or on their own motorcycle. Noncommissioned officers, ensigns, and officers will receive the right to wear civilian clothes outside the unit.

Krenz Meeting With Berlin Workers Noted

PM2310095189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "'We Have No Magic Wand'"]

[Text] Berlin, 20 Oct—E. Krenz, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee, and G. Schabowski, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the SED Central Committee, and first secretary of Berlin party bezirk committee, have had a discussion lasting several hours with the collective at the 7 October Machine Tool Building Combine. Many acute problems currently of concern both to the leadership and to the republic's working people were discussed in a businesslike and open atmosphere, and the need to rapidly resolve them was noted.

The discussion was very frank. The workers talked about the serious shortcomings in the assessment of their work and about the fact that a slipshod performance often receives the same reward as conscientious and creative work. They pointed to shortcomings in supply and to the lack of the proper mutual understanding between enterprises producing end products and their affiliated plants, proposing specific measures to rectify the situation.

A whole number of issues concerning the speech by the secretary of the SED Central Committee at the recent Central Committee plenum were also raised. Why were certain provisions in the plenum speech vague? When will the implementation of the democratization program start producing its first results? Is it permissible that, given the shortcomings in supplies to the domestic market large quantities of quality output are exported? Will combines and enterprises gain genuine independence?

We have no magic wand which we can wave to solve all social problems easily and painlessly. That is why I was unable to give specific answers to all the questions raised by life. We will together seek ways to eradicate shortcomings. Historic truth is on our side, but we must have the courage to talk frankly about shortcomings, however awkward reality may be. There is simply no other way forward, the general secretary noted.

The refugee question, which is worrying the public, was also touched upon. As was noted at the SED Central Committee plenum, more than 100,000 people, mostly skilled workers, have left for the West.

The settlement of the travel question does not depend only on our good will, E. Krenz stressed. Many obstacles are also being erected on the Western side. We cannot permit GDR citizens to be considered "second-class" citizens in the West. The GDR is and will always continue to be a sovereign state. Bonn, if it is interested in good-neighborly relations, must take this into account. For our part, the party and the government will take every measure to ensure respect for citizens' legitimate rights. New provisions are currently being drawn up on this issue. Before being ratified by the People's Chamber, these provisions will be submitted for discussion by the general public. [Second Edition of 21 Oct PRAVDA in Russian p 4 renders the last two paragraphs as follows:

The members and candidate members of the SED Central Committee Politburo and the first secretaries of party bezirk committees are visiting industrial enterprises, meeting with working people, and consulting with them on urgent changes. Open and frank discussions about everything of concern to the country's citizens were conducted yesterday evening on GDR TV.

The resolution of the problems facing the GDR is a task for all the country's citizens. This was discussed at a meeting between E. Krenz and Bishop W. Leich, deputy chairman of the State Council and chairman of the Federation of Evangelical Churches.]

SED Develops Dialogue With Public

PM2310100589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Confidence Is Built Through Deeds"]

[Text] Berlin, 21 Oct—Intense activeness is a distinguishing feature of political life in the GDR nowadays. The country has launched an open and critical dialogue on the topical political and economic problems perturbing working people. Members of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Politburo, first secretaries of SED bezirk committees, ministers, and representatives of the GDR National Front are holding meetings with enterprise collectives and are engaging in frank discussions of shortcomings and the ways to eliminate them.

Answering questions during a conversation with construction workers in the capital, G. Schabowski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee and first secretary of Berlin party bezirk committee, declared that pressure and dialogue are mutually exclusive. Pressure and ultimatums are useless as methods for conducting dialogue. We need openness, honesty, sincerity, and mutual respect. If the SED today is seeking broad discussion with all social forces, it is only because this is demanded by the present level of the GDR's maturity.

During the conversation which is now under way, leaders of local organs of power are meeting with representatives of different strata of the population. The city mayor and representatives of Evangelical and Catholic church circles are taking part in the dialogue in Dresden.

One of the questions raised during the dialogue concerns the opportunities for GDR citizens to travel abroad. Today's NEUES DEUTSCHLAND commentary is devoted to this topic. We, the newspaper writes, want such opportunities for everyone. It is well known that the SED Central Committee Politburo submitted a proposal to the GDR Government to prepare a draft law on travel by GDR citizens abroad. Following a public discussion, this draft will be examined and adopted by the People's Chamber.

At the same time, the newspaper notes, there are difficulties and obstacles in this question's solution. The main difficulty is an economic one: Travel abroad will require considerable foreign currency expenditure. As for the obstacles, they are being created by Bonn, which does not recognize GDR citizenship and insists on its "duty as guardian of all Germans."

GDR working people note with bitterness the fact that tens of thousands of young people have traveled illegally to the FRG over the last few weeks. Replying to journalists' questions about the latest decisions made in this context, a Foreign Ministry spokesman declared that the GDR, by agreement with Poland's government, has given permission to its citizens who are now in the FRG Embassy in Warsaw to travel to third countries. This was prompted by humanitarian considerations. At the same time, everyone wishing to return to the GDR can apply accordingly to GDR diplomatic missions abroad, including the permanent mission in the FRG.

"Now we must restore order in everything, step by step," Martin Wagner, a worker at the Brandenburg steel casting and rolling plant, declared. "There must be no empty promises."

Bovin on E. European Socialism, Market Economics

LD2210205589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Oct 89

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Is the restoration of capitalism in Hungary or Poland possible? I have not, to be honest, a direct and simple, unambiguous answer. I think that both in Hungary and Poland, and perhaps in other countries, there are social forces and groups which will nudge events in that direction, to capitalism. But I do not have sufficient theoretical imagination to picture a return to classical capitalism. And not only because such a capitalism simply does not exist, but furthermore because in the years of the creation of the new way of life, in the years of socialism, whatever deprecatory epithets we may be awarding ourselves these days, irreversible changes have taken place in the social consciousness.

So, more realistic would seem to me another road, the road—if one can put it that way—of social-democratization of society, the road of gradual synthesis of the principles of the year 1979, and of the year 1917. But we often forget that capitalism started this work long ago. Such demands, classical demands of communists and social democrats as, for instance, an 8 or 7-hour working day, paid holidays, social insurance, concern for working and living conditions—all this was organized precisely in capitalist countries, and actually more fully than in socialist countries. Well, our opponents have turned out to be cleverer than we, and now it seems that we, too, have realized that if the capitalists have learned planning, why should we not master the intricacies of the market mechanism?

I shall not specifically characterize the situation in each country. There are as many situations as there are socialist countries, so there are different attitudes to perestroyka. So far only Albania comes out with standards unfurled against perestroyka and against the renewal of socialism, only the Albanian Workers' Party [AWP].

Recently, at the 8th plenum of the AWP Central Committee, Lenko Cuko, member of the Politburo, secretary of the Central Committee, stated: Modern revisionism has mounted a crude campaign which has gone so far that the teachings of Marxism-Leninism are being subjected to revision by parties and socialisms. In a number of countries, for instance in the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, the bourgeois thesis of political and ideological pluralism is being openly proclaimed. Perestroyka and glasnost have shown, says this same Lenka Cuko, that all these actions are directed at the restoration of capitalism and the transformation of the communist party into a bourgeois social democratic party. Period.

So, it is practically useless arguing, it is meangingless, for it is not theoretical arguments that are being decided here but social practice. Well, in general I would say that a whole historical span is now ending in the development of Eastern Europe, a span whose content was directly determined by the outcome of World War II, our victory in that war and the role which was played, the special role that was played by the Soviet Union. Before our eyes new economic, political, social structures are starting to take shape. This is a very interesting process but also rather alarming.

We know well what socialism was like when it entered the crisis, but we do not know what we will be like when we get out of this crisis, when it is over. Surprises are possible here, and not only pleasant ones. How, for instance, will the fate of CEMA take shape? How will the Warsaw Pact evolve? What passions will be fired—and they are already being fired—around the German question? How will the changes in Eastern Europe be reflected in the general scheme of European Europolitics? How are we to act in the critical situations which may arise? All this should be thought through fundamentally and deeply, now in order to be ready for tomorrow.

State of Soviet-Albanian Relations Viewed

PM2310134189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by G. Mitkevich: "Albania: Memorable Date"]

[Excerpts] This is the 45th anniversary of the session of Albania's Antifascist National Liberation Council held in Berat. Its decisions played an important part in establishing the Albanian people's democratic state. [passage omitted]

One of the session's most important decisions was the transformation of the antifascist national liberation committee into the provisional democratic government of Albania. The new government came out with a program which formulated the basic principles of Albania's domestic and foreign policy. [passage omitted]

From the first days of the activity of the transitional Albanian Government the Soviet Union maintained close friendly ties with it through the representatives of the Soviet military mission in the country and in 1945 it officially recognized it and established diplomatic relations with Albania. Soviet-Albanian relations at that period developed rapidly and upward. In close collaboration with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries the Albanian working people laid the foundation for the country's further industrialization and the development of agriculture and the boosting of the people's material and cultural living standard.

But in the early 1960s Soviet-Albanian relations were destroyed. A large part here was played by elements of subjectivism and voluntarism displayed at that time in the approach toward the differences which arose on ideological questions and a number of international problems. Unfortunately, they were transferred to the sphere of interstate relations, which eventually lead to the ending of ties between the Soviet Union and Albania, whose diversity and mutually advantageous nature had previously been repeatedly noted by both sides.

The Soviet Union denounces the practice of transferring ideological differences to relations between states. Our country consistently advocates seeking mutually acceptable ways of restoring normal relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, which would accord with the interests of the Soviet and Albanian peoples and the cause of peace and socialism.

Yazov Greets SFRY's Kadijevic on Anniversary

PM2010102989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[USSR Defense Minister Army General D. Yazov undated greetings message to Colonel General V. Kadijevic, SFRY federal secretary for national defense, on 40th anniversary of Belgrade's liberation]

[Text] To Comrade Colonel General Veljko Kadijevic, SFRY federal secretary for national defense

Esteemed Comrade Federal Secretary!

Personally and on behalf of the USSR Armed Forces I send you and all Yugoslav servicemen sincere congratulations and combat greetings on the 45th anniversary of the liberation of Belgrade from the German fascist invaders.

The liberation of Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia, which marked the start of a decisive stage in the rout of the fascist invaders on the country's territory, is a symbol of our armies' combat cooperation and a bright page in the history of the joint struggle of the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples against a common enemy. We express the profound conviction that the further strengthening of friendship and the development of broad cooperation between the armed forces of the USSR and Yugoslavia accord with the interests of our countries' peoples.

I wish Yugoslav servicemen further successes in improving combat skill in the interests of strengthening the motherland's defense capability.

Army General D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

West Europe

Officials Reaffirm Wallenberg Death in 1947

LD2010185389 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT 20 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS—Soviet officials emphasised today that Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat who helped save thousands of people during the Second World War in Hungary, died in Lubyanka prison in 1947.

Wallenberg's relatives and leaders of the Wallenberg Society are currently visiting Moscow to obtain additional facts about Wallenberg's fate, after his arrest by Soviet military authorities in 1945 in Budapest.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Valentin Nikiforov and Deputy KGB Chairman Vladimir Pirozhkov told the Swedish delegation that the fact of Wallenberg's death in 1947 is undisputable.

Today's meeting discussed the evidence of witnesses who claimed to have seen Raoul Wallenberg or heard that he was alive long after 1947, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Nikolay Uspenskiy told reporters at the Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Centre today.

The Soviet side carefully studied these reports, but they provide no grounds to doubt Wallenburg's death in 1947, Uspenskiy said.

"All reports of witnesses who allegedly saw or heard that Wallenberg was serving in different prisons are so indirect, vague and contradictory that they cannot elicit any serious conclusions," he said.

Since many reports mentioned the Vladimir prison, Wallenberg's relatives were read an official statement by pensioner Yelena Butova, who was head of the prison's medical department from 1946 to 1978.

In the statement, Butova says that she first heard about Wallenberg in 1988, and that no one with such a name ever sought her help.

A statement of another doctor, Larisa Sukhacheva, who worked in the prison from 1953 to 1962, was also shown to the relatives. Sukhacheva denied ever hearing about or treating Wallenberg.

Similar statements from other witnesses mentioned in the list presented by the Swedish side were shown to the Swedish delegation. All these documents will be made available to Wallenberg's relatives.

They were also told that they can go to Vladimir at any time to check the reports.

The Swedish representatives took notice of these explanations, but said they intend to continue the search for Wallenberg, according to Uspenskiy.

"This is their right, and should they have new questions, The Soviet side is prepared to offer help and cooperation," Uspenskiy concluded.

News Conference Held in Helsinki on Perestroyka

LD2310203989 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 1600 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Excerpts] The separation of party and administrative power might in the near future be decided on the local level in the Soviet Union, at least as a test. This was said at a press conference in Helsinki today. The press conference was preparing the ground for the visit to Finland by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. However, the Soviet guests defended the combining of the highest party and state administration office in one pair of hands at the current stage of the perestroyka policy. Marja Nikkilae reporting:

[Nikkilae] Soviet preliminary groups for the Gorbachev visit are touring the country and the most important group is giving press conferences in Helsinki, a custom which has been the norm also on Gorbachev's other visits abroad. The star is the head of the Information Department of the Foreign Ministry, Gennadiy Gerasimov, who is also known on television around the world.

The guests had chosen as the topic of today's press conference the current state of perestroyka. The necessity of perestroyka was not questioned by anybody behind the table, but according to a weaver of (Kostroma Lenin Cooperative), Valentina Kletneva, the intelligentsia has so far been on the top of the wave and received more from perestroyka than workers. [passage omitted]

[Nikkilae] An author also known in Finland, Vasiliy Belov, on his part said that many members of the intelligentsia have caught the virus of nationalism. According to him there are decisive differences between the intelligentsia in Moscow and in the countryside, but all in all the intelligentsia is disappointed with the speed of perestroyka. [passage omitted]

[Nikkilae] Perestroyka is in a period of transition, that is clear. How we are going to get over this period, that is a worry to many. The Soviet guests did not see that the limits in the right to strike are dangerous for democratic reforms. One question caused a slight confusion in the group answering the questions: Were they not at all worried about the fact that so much power has been collected in one pair of hands, those of Gorbachev's, he is after all leading both the party and the state apparatus. Even in the changes of people it could be possible to see that many so-called "Da" ["yes"] men from Gorbachev's point of view end up in the highest leadership. Through international comparisons the people answering came to the conclusion that at this stage of reform policy it is necessary to put together the highest offices—maybe even to abolish ideas of some kind of palace revolution.

But on the lower level this combination of party and administrative apparatus, which was surprisingly also supported by Gorbachev a little while ago, will be relaxed, at least in a test sense, that is the decision will be given to the local level. In the discussions lately, the hard words of Gorbachev have aroused a lot of attention and maybe even fear, hard words towards those journalists whose pen has not written according to the will of the party leardeship. [passage omitted]

[Nikkilae] The deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, Andrey Grachov, assures that the party leadership still thinks that glasnost is an important and necessary implement of perestroyka. But will the slow economy still be the grave of glasnost, that thought is now bothering people both in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the world.

Finnish Officials Preview Gorbachev Visit

SSDP Party Chief Iivari

LD2210112289 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 22 Oct 89

[Text] Helsinki October 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Voytto Leskinen:

The Finnish Social Democratic Party (SSDP) attaches great importance to the forthcoming visit to Finland by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the party's secretary-general Ulpu Iivari told TASS.

The visit serves to underline that the goodneighbourly relations between Finland and the Soviet Union are permanent and developing.

Iivari said the visit will enable to discuss at summit level bilateral economic cooperation, which should be expanded in future in a planned and purposeful manner. It is necessary, without any prejudice, make wide use of the new possibilities which were created in the course of perestroika in the USSR for developing such cooperation.

In Finnish-Soviet relations, she continued, ecological issues will occupy an important place in future. Therefore the signing of an agreement on cooperation in the field of nature conservation during the forthcoming visit should be regarded as a major step forward.

Having noted that the SSDP-CPSU relations of 20 years standing have been developing positively, Iivari stressed that struggle for peace and disarmament occupies main place in these relations.

The SSDP, she said, works for peace and hails Gorbachev's initiatives and activity in the field of disarmament, which promotes stronger stability in Europe and the world. In this respect, Iivari stressed, the party shared the idea of common European home proposed by the Soviet leader.

Parliament Speaker Sorsa

LD2210221689 Moscow TASS in English 2206 GMT 22 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—"On the eve of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Finland the Nordic countries are most interested in his vision of the role of the Nordic nations and place given to them by the Soviet Union in a future common European home," speaker of the Finnish Parliament Kalevi Sorsa said in an interview with Soviet television which was televised on Sunday—on the eve of Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Finland.

He emphasised that Europe now had favourable conditions for building a common home. The countries are ready to think in a new way without prejudice. pRactical shifts in disarmament have decreased doubts and mistrust. "This is taking place in both parts of the divided Europe," Sorsa emphasised. He said that European countries could not miss the opportunities created by the current international atmosphere on their continent.

Sorsa noted that the Nordic countries had close historical contacts with the Soviet Union and its peoples and welcomed Gorbachev's initiatives on European politics.

The speaker of the Finnish parliament said that Finland was also focussing attention on ecology. The Finnish people will be particularly interested in Gorbachev's initiatives on ecological problems and prospects of Soviet-Finnish cooperation in the protection of nature.

In his speech in Murmansk Gorbachev suggested that efforts be united to protect the nature of the region, Sorsa said. He hoped that this would eventually lead to an appropriate agreement.

Supreme Soviet Session

Committee Hears Kryuchkov Report on Border Guards

PM2310154789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev and Captain 3d Rank V. Urban: "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and State Security Questions: Is the Border Secure?"]

[Text] It is true that we have grown used to the phrase "the border is under lock and key" and attribute a certain meaning to it. But is this lock strong enough, is it secure enough, is its mechanism up to date, and are such locking devices, which until very recently were indispensable, really necessary everywhere? These questions require clarification. This was the topic of discussion at a session of the committee which examined the question "On the work of border guards in current conditions."

To begin with, a few figures. Our state has the longest border—almost 62,000 km, of which around 22,000 km are on land. Since 1985, border troops have been guarding the 200-mile maritime economic zone. In organizational terms, the border guards are divided into 10 border districts (until recently there were twice as many). They total 200,000 men. During last year and this some 3,400 border violators have been detained.

These and many other figures were cited by Army General V.A. Matrosov, deputy chairman of the USSR KGB and chief of the USSR KGB Main Border Guards Directorate, in his speech to deputies. These figures illustrate the importance and crucial nature of the tasks entrusted to the border guards, the perestroyka processes which are under way within their units, and also the results of their work. Incidentally, the times are long gone when these results were assessed solely according to how many violators had been detained. Today the border guards' tasks include the protection of the USSR's interests on the border in both political and economic terms.

Indeed, we know, we remember well, what it means to have a tense atmosphere on the border. We recall it in the events, albeit remote, on Damanskiy Island. And the fact that life along our border with neighboring China—all 7,500 km of it—is following a normal course speaks volumes. It was precisely details of this kind which prompted the USSR KGB leadership to suggest that in the course of restructuring the entire system of state border protection, the border crossing procedure be simplified, barbed wire barriers be removed on many sections of the border, and a switch be effected to modern technical means of border surveillance.

However, we are still a long way from complete tranquillity and security on the border. Army General Matrosov stated this in his speech. And so did deputies who spoke at the committee session. In the border areas of the Central Asian republics alone, 400 kg of narcotics were confiscated over the past 18 months in attempts to violate the border. Since the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, its territory is being actively used to infiltrate armed groups into our territory.

Poaching is causing special concern. According to Army General Matrosov, these activities are sometimes of a purely political nature, as for instance in our territorial waters bordering Japan. This year alone there have been some 9,000 attempts by Japanese vessels to enter our country's territory in the area of the Southern Kuriles.

The committee members' questions and speeches dwelled on key problems of the border guards' life and work.

The deputies also intend to study thoroughly the problems pertaining to the social sphere. Meanwhile, a few figures. Some 5,000 border guards officers, warrant officers, and ensigns need new housing. There are not enough preschool children's establishments, and there are difficulties in finding jobs for members of their families.

The session was addressed by V.A. Kryuchkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR KGB. He emphasized that the new political thinking also calls for a new concept in line with the interests of protecting our state border. It should incorporate fundamentally new elements and provisions as a result of the fact that the situation on the border, the international atmosphere, and attitudes to us in neighboring countries have radically changed. One of the key measures on the road toward formulating this new concept is the substantial reduction of the border zone, which now totals 3.6 million square kilometers. To maintain this zone today makes no sense, in the KGB leadership's opinion. It needs to be reduced, once we have elaborated a system of measures to ensure border security.

One of the tasks to which a cardinal solution has not yet been found is the protection of the economic zone. It has to be admitted, V.A. Kryuchkov said, that some of the natural resources located in that zone are being illegally diverted to other countries. They must not only be retained, but also turned into an asset of our national economy.

Having examined the USSR KGB's activity in organizing the protection of the state border, the parliamentary committee endorsed that activity and adopted specific decisions aimed at improving the work.

Gorbachev Interviewed on Work of Supreme Soviet

LD2310231589 Prague Television Service in Czech 1830 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Interview with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Supreme Soviet, by unidentified correspondent on 23

October; place not given; Gorbachev's reply in Russian with superimposed Czech translation—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] How do you assess the work of the Supreme Soviet during its first and second session? what is the role of the parliament in Soviet society today?

[Gorbachev] I assess the congress of people's Deputies and the first session of Supreme Soviet very positively. They signify a change in our life which is ever deeper. If the Congress of People's Deputies and the first session of the Supreme Soviet provided an example of openness, a principled stand, high demands and an example of people's power, then the current second session of the Supreme Soviet shows that it is a parliament which operates normally in the way it is supposed to function.

I observe with great satisfaction how professionalism has been growing every day and how principled stands have been increasing too.

We must also bear in mind that the current stage of restructuring is very important for us. We have started to deal with cardinal problems of our economic development. The second stage of political reform is ahead of us. We must adopt essential measures to improve the health of our finances, the economy and the market. And in this situation it is particularly important that all issues are asessed with great responsibility, with great competence and professionalism. Here we will not only find out what is happening beyond the Kremlin gate, but life has a direct influence on the work of the Supreme Soviet. This is shown sometimes in the fact that the parliament does not proceed in a typical fashion. But when the situation in the country is marked by great involvement of the masses in policy, when life is bubbling everywhere, in a situation like this parliament cannot sit comfortably in a conference hall. Life is therefore a direct participant and is present in the session, so to speak. In my view, this is also an important element which shows that the parliament has a great responsibility to the people and that it is tied to them with living links. In every case I think that the parliament is becoming stronger, and it will continue to intensify its work.

Moscow TV Carries 23 Oct Supreme Soviet Session

1600 GMT

LD2310183489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT begins carrying a recording of the 23 October session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin. The session starts with Mikhail Gorbachev in the chair and 397 members registered as present. Gorbachev declares the joint session open, noting that it is to examine draft changes and additions to the Constitution on matters relating to the electoral system. Lykyanov takes the floor to deliver his report.

At 1608 Ryzhkov is shown among those listening.

At 1630 Gorbachev asks how they will handle questions. Sobchak notes the need for these amendments in the light of the bills for economic reform, and asks about amendments relating to other matters other than the electoral system. Lukyanov notes that more amendments will be presented to the Congress, such as those arising from the law on property. But all of this must be done article by article.

At 1634 Gorbunov clarifies a point he made at the meeting of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet relating to direct elections.

At 1636 a Lithuanian deputy suggests the adoption of a single article placing the responsibility for such matters in the sphere of the republics themselves. Lukyanov says there has to be a sense of measure in this.

At 1638 a deputy asks a question relating to the election of presidents in the republics. Lukyanov replies.

At 1641 Deputy Magomedov asks a question about Article 96. Lukyanov clarifies the procedures for appointing officials.

At 1643 a deputy refers to Article 95 on the election of deputies from public organizations. Lukyanov replies.

At 1644 a deputy asks about possible contradictions in the system for electing deputies from public organizations and the principle of one man one vote. Lukyanov gives his view that there is no contradiction here.

At 1648 Deputy Bogdanov asks about Article 100. Lukyanov replies.

At 1651 a deputy asks about those on remand and their status under the article excluding those with the right to vote.

At 1652 a deputy suggests a change to Article 95. Gorbachev says they are listening only to questions, not speeches. Lukyanov points out the difference in the given matter between the union and the republics. Further questions are submitted on the number of candidates who can be included on the voting paper.

At 1656 the announcer says the recording will break for 15 minutes.

1712 GMT

LD2310193989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1712 GMT on 23 October continues its recording of the 23 October Session of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin. The announcer superimposes a 4-minute resume of earlier proceedings.

At 1716 Deputy Denisov asks question about whether the Congress of People's Deputies as it is should remain in existence. Lukyanov states that the Congress justified itself though things may change.

At 1717 Deputy Krasilnikov asks another question abut rights of nomination. Lukyanov asserts the importance of precision in formulation of law.

At 1719 another deputy asks about amendments relating to secession from the USSR.

At 1720 Deputy Zolutuknin asks a question. Deputy Chelyshev wonders whether the Supreme Soviet is not allowing people in republics to establish organizations quickly so as to be nominated for elections. Lukyanov says that candidates should have equal financial and material support. Gorbachev interrupts, saying this question should be discussed in committees.

At 1724 a deputy asks for explanation of a phrase in draft law. Deputy Nikolaychuk asks about the status of deputies—republican or union?

At 1726 Deputy Shcherbak from Kiev questions the correctness of wording. Deputy Kolesnikov asks about Article 96 and elections of people to two local soviets. Lukyanov responds.

At 1729 Sakharov says this is a very important issue and we should have commissions' suggestions on this draft law. He asks several specific questions relating to participation of initiative groups in elections. Gorbachev says this has already been answered. Sakharov reiterates the view that those under investigation but not convicted should have the right to be nominated a candidate in elections. Lukyanov says the relevant article will not be changed.

At 1733 Lukyanov continues to stress the importance of this. Gorbachev interrupts and supports Lukyanov.

At 1734 Deputy Zhuravlev recalls a deputy's question about what a union republic is, and suggests the Constitution should not be partially amended. We will only make it worse, he says. Lukyanov asserts what he said on a previous occasion about the status of union republics.

At 1737 Deputy Izmailov asks about the right of secession of union republics. Lukyanov says the right will remain but reiterates the supremacy of the USSR Constitution.

At 1739 Deputy Tsyplyayev asks another question on this same issue. Gorbachev suggests one more speaker be given the floor before debates begin. A Latvian deputy asks about the election of presidents in Union republics. Would such a person not represent someone trusted by the people in that republic, elected by them? Lukyanov again stresses his view that if a president is to exist, his powers have to be rigidly defined. The introduction of such an institution would involve a fundamental change in the structure of power. He says the concentration of power in one person is against Soviet practice.

At 1744 further questions come from the floor. A deputy asks about the number of candidates and Lukyanov says he has answered this before.

At 1747 Gorbachev says 30 minutes remain. Debates begin with Shapovalenko who speaks about direct elections. The people should have the right to direct elections, he says, then those elected would truly have the mandate of the people. Let's have referendums, let the people decide issues, he adds. He also speaks about constituency meetings. He believes that top oblast officials have sufficient power and should not occupy more than one post.

At 1754 Deputy Pukhova focuses on the issue of the need for women to have equal rights in political life, especially in bodies of power. Women have been pushed into a passive role in political life by the system's rigidity. The fact that many rayons did not even put forward a single woman for elections can only be described as the result of male chauvinism, she maintains. Pukhova quotes international documents on discrimination. What can be done to correct the situation? She recalls the experience of other countries including Finland and Norway where there are definite quotas for the number of women in positions of power. She asks for support to be given to women in forthcoming elections.

At 1801 Deputy Ryabchenko says he will be giving the views of the Committee for Science and Public Education. He goes on to say that the bill does not ensure uniformity of representative systems in various republics. Perhaps these matters should be left to the republics themselves, subject to observance of certain basic requisites.

At 1808 Ryabchenko proceeds to discuss various aspects of different forms of nominating candidates, financing of election campaigns, and the formation of election commissions.

At 1811 Gorbachev announces a recess.

1812 GMT

LD2310223889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1812 GMT on 23 October continues its recording of the 23 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin. Gorbachev suggests 1 hour for debates, but voices from the floor suggest half an hour as there must be further committee work on the bill. A vote is called.

At 1814, 318 vote in favor of shortening the debate, but it appears that there is not a quorum.

At 1816 Gorbachev asks for a new registration to be carried out. 399 are present. A repeat vote is called. 346 are in favor of cutting short the debate, with 36 against and 8 abstentions.

At 1919 Deputy Nikolskiy takes the floor and begins to discuss various shortcomings of having candidates for deputies from public organizations. This gives some voters more than one vote. This should not detract in any way from the present legislative body, but this arrangement should be avoided in the future.

Nikolskiy discusses whether the head of state should be elected in a direct ballot.

At 1823 Deputy Rogozhina takes the floor, saying she wants to respond to Deputy Ryabchenko's allegations that nobody knows who elected the Soviet Women's Committee and why it should have its own deputies. She proceeds to describe the work of the committee.

At 1826 Deputy Yemelyanov says in his contribution that the bill should have been debated at the summer session, which could have set minimum criteria for the republican elections. He goes on to examine advantages and disadvantages of various possible options for electoral laws.

At 1835 Deputy Samarin comes to the lectern to say that the Constitution cannot be too detailed and should not lay down specific numbers of deputies for various electoral districts. This should be included in a separate electoral law. He goes on to discuss the issue of public organizations' deputies and the issue of establishing minimum criteria for regional levels and leaving the rest to them.

At 1841 Deputy Pylin takes the floor and proposes amendments to the provisions for electing local soviet officials. He also says there should be no restrictions on deputies taking part in elections at various levels.

At 1843 Gorbachev says he wants to sum up the debate so far. He discusses various aspects of electoral legislation and goes on to propose a decision for adoption on the debate.

At 1855 Deputy Shcherbak raises a question connected with the coming elections for the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

At 1859 Gorbachev replies to further questions.

At 1900 Yeltsin proposes devoting tomorrow evening's session to discussion of the elections issue. Another deputy makes another proposal. Gorbachev sums up, and puts to the vote procedure for tomorrow's session: 361 for, 11 against, 9 abstentions: motion approved. Gorbachev puts to the vote that commitees and commissions work on the draft for further discussion tomorrow: 361 for, 3 against, 10 abstentions: motion approved.

At 1904 Shevardnadze takes the floor, saying he often speaks abroad, but not so often to such a forum. Vorontsov shown in auditorium. Gorbachev appears to be absent from the session, with Lukyanov in the chair.

2007 GMT

LD2310223989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2007 GMT on 23 October continues its recording of the 23 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin. Lukyanov asks deputies how to deal with questions to the the foreign minister. He goes on to read out a draft resolution approving the report given by Shevardnadze. The letter says he will be glad to reply to questions in committee. Lukyanov puts to the vote whether debates will open: also puts to the vote not to open debates, but to invite deputies to committee to put their questions to Shevardnadze. A deputy says there should be discussion of such a matter at a plenary session. Lukyanov notes the possibility of such a discussion. He puts it to the vote: 278 for, 60 against, 12 abstained. Deputies then vote on draft resolution, to approve the report and to hear such reports on a regular basis: put to the vote: 324 for, 8 against, 13 abstained. Lukyanov outlines agenda for 24 October. Chairmen or representatives of committees and commissions to meet at 1000 tomorrow at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

At 2018 Deputy Guliy asks a question about Soviet-Japanese relations. Lukyanov directs him to the relevant committee.

At 2019 Deputy Suleymenov notes that there has been no reply to date to the recent appeal from the Supreme Soviet to the U.S. Congress on banning nuclear tests. He goes on to note a demonstration in Kazakhstan. He lists recent nuclear tests in the republic. He notes the need for the government to keep its word in the matter of nuclear tests. Lukyanov says what he has said will be passed on to the relevant ministries.

At 2022 Sakharov says it is useless to hear Shevardnadze's report without discussing it—they could have read it in the papers. There has to be discussion of such a matter. Lukyanov points out that the Supreme Soviet has already voted on this. Discussion in the committee does not rule out discussion at a plenary session.

At 2024 Lukyanov explains the procedure for advertising future agenda and goes on to point out possible coincidence of republican and union Supreme Soviet sessions on 25 October. Nishanov gives the addresses for meetings of committees and commissions. Lukyanov announces a break until 1400 Moscow time [1100 GMT] on 24 October.

PRAVDA Reports 23 Oct Supreme Soviet Debate

*PM2410110989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Oct 89 First Edition p 1*

["PRAVDA Parliamentary Group" report: "Affirming Democracy"]

[Text] Two main topics are perhaps being singled out today in the country's political life. First, attention is still focused on the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet session, where most pressing problems for the state are under discussion and acute debates are continuing. Second, preparations for the elections to local organs of power are developing. The quality and extent of the further deepening of the processes of democratization and glasnost and the development of the economic and political spheres also depend on how these elections go.

Both these topics were interwoven yesterday at the joint sitting of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, where an item relating to the draft Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution on questions of the electoral system was first on the agenda.

A. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, delivered a report on the draft law. He pointed out that, although at first glance there are few constitutional amendments, they are of vital significance for extending union republics' autonomy both in initiating legislation on questions of the electoral system and in holding the elections themselves. Anatoliy Ivanovich spoke about the composition of the commission which prepared the draft and how it operated, and explained why various proposed amendments to the Constitution were accepted or rejected. In his opinion, the proposed draft law will make it possible to hold elections to local organs of power more democratically in view of the experience in electing USSR people's deputies.

A. Lukyanov then gave detailed answers to numerous questions put by deputies. We will not retell this dialogue, but it is nonetheless worth dwelling on two elements, since we believe them to be of fundamental importance.

Deputy A. Sobchak pointed out that the current session is discussing a mass of problems—inter alia, questions of ownership, leasing, and others—whose resolution will also require constitutional amendments. How will this be done, and when?

A lucid response followed: Corresponding draft amendments to the constitution are also affixed to such draft laws. These documents will be discussed and adopted at the same time. Moreover, a new version of the Fundamental Law which will take all these amendments into consideration is currently being elaborated.

Well, a rational solution in our view: It makes it possible to promptly make the changes to the Constitution without which the political reform is making slow progress right now. Incidentally, A. Lukyanov said that a draft USSR Supreme Soviet resolution, which will acknowledge the possibility of changing republic legislation on elections of people's deputies within the framework of this draft law, is being submitted to deputies for consideration for precisely this purpose in order to accelerate the implementation of electoral reform.

A. Lukyanov also answered questions about the advisability of possibly electing one representative to two soviets. In his opinion—an opinion shared by most parliamentarians—retaining this principle will make it possible to safeguard the vertical link between the soviets, resolve questions at different levels of power constructively, and really hand over power to the soviets.

Then the debate began. According to Deputy V. Shapovalenko, the most acute elements which provoke just complaints from voters have remained unchanged in the proposed draft amendments to the USSR Constitution. It is a question, in particular, of the lack of direct elections of soviet chairmen. The article regarding the holding of okrug election meetings if more than 10 candidate deputies are nominated in an electoral okrug also arouses doubts. The apparatus will always be able to top this figure in order to "cut out" unsuitable candidacies.

Deputy S. Ryabchenko said that elections of deputies from public organizations should under no circumstances become elections of the representatives of their leading organs.

Is it quite normal, Deputy B. Nikolskiy asked, for the same person to be able to take part in elections on several occasions? Public organizations are entitled to nominate their own candidates, but they should only be elected in electoral okrugs.

The results of the debate were summed up by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The discussion showed, he pointed out, that the document still requires in-depth study, since many of its provisions rightly provoke public concern. The deputies decided to close the plenary sitting at 1400 hours, in order not to delay the adoption of the amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution on questions relating to the electoral system, and to continue discussing them in Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. The draft USSR Law "On Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) on Questions Relating to the Electoral System" will once again be submitted for the parliament's discussion on Tuesday 24 October after the finishing touches have been put to it.

USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze delivered a report at the session on the Foreign Ministry's work to implement the main directions of our country's foreign policy. His speech reinstated the practice that existed under V.I. Lenin, whereby the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs submitted annual reports to the Congress of Soviets.

The head of the Soviet foreign policy department, inter alia, assessed the results of his recent talks in the United States, Nicaragua, and Cuba. Touching on the draft laws being considered by the USSR Supreme Soviet, E. Shevardnadze stressed that they are of tremendous international significance. In particular, the adoption of the Law on Ownership and a number of other fundamental legislative acts linked with it are a necessary precondition for the Soviet Union's extensive participation in the international division of labor and for the compatibility of our economy with the world economic system.

To complete our notes from the Kremlin, we cannot fail to mention that deputies' long awaited juridical literature kiosk has opened here. A line has formed around it since the morning. But, as one deputy said, the voters are also acutely in need of this kind of literature...

Lukyanov Proposes Constitutional Changes

PM2310203089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2

["On Changes to the USSR Constitution on Questions of the Electoral System: A.I. Lukyanov's Speech at the Second USSR Supreme Soviet Session"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies!

Two draft documents have been submitted for your examination: the USSR Law on Amendments and Additions to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR on Questions of the Electoral System, and a corresponding USSR Supreme Soviet resolution.

First of all it should be stressed that the drafting of the law fulfills the direct instructions of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies to the Supreme Soviet. The Congress, as you remember, pointed out the need to strengthen constitutional guarantees of the constructive development of the democratic process in the country, ensure the consistent democratization of the electoral system, and take into account more fully, in drafting republican electoral laws, the experience of the recent elections of USSR people's deputies.

These elections, for all the inevitable defects in such a pioneering event, were without precedent in our experience both in the degree of democratism, glasnost, and the political activeness of citizens, and in the heat of the election contest itself. They showed that the majority of Soviet people resolutely support perestroyka and the course of implementation of economic and political reforms and radical renewal of all aspects of our society's life.

And today every one of us is realizing increasingly clearly that the more rapidly the mechanism of people's power is improved and the more democratic and effective it becomes, the more successfully the tasks of perestroyka will be resolved in all other spheres of life—the economy, the sphere of social and national relations, and international affairs.

We have every reason to say that the new model of people's power is gradually assuming increasingly real characteristics. These are connected with the implementation of the tasks of the first stage of political reform, in the course of which the reconstruction of the highest component of the soviets of people's deputies was carried out and new constitutional principles on the structure of central power, the electoral system, and the principles and procedure for elections were tested in practice. Of course, not all the innovations met with the same evaluation among the public, and we came across a number of defects and shortcomings, some of them in the course of the elections. But no one can dispute the substantial progress in the electoral system that the 1989 elections brought us. No one can call into question the fact that as a result of these elections a fundamentally new highest component of power was created—new in its composition, its functions, the way its work is organized, and its democratic potential.

Today the country is on the threshold of the second stage of the political reform. A stage that is no easier than the first. Its essence lies in the creation of a new system of organs of power in the republics and locally—in the krays, oblasts, and cities and in rural localities. This is the biggest, mass component of people's power. Its successful functioning and how well it operates within the general system of people's power will determine to an enormous extent the results of perestroyka and the implementation in practice of the laws adopted here, within these walls. Hence the significance that is attached to improving the procedure for forming the republican and local organs of power.

The elections to these posts are not far off. They will take place on 25 February in the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Moldavia, and Armenia, and, on 4 March, in the Russian Federation. And in some republics—Kazakhstan, Latvia, Tajikistan, Estonia—it is proposed to hold the elections to local soviets this December. Naturally, this requires a new legislative base, founded on the norms of the union Constitution and taking into account the pros and cons of the last elections and the dramatically increased sociopolitical activeness of citizens.

That is why it is now our priority task to make amendments to the USSR Constitution on questions of the electoral system, the need for which was acknowledged by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The main purpose of these amendments is to give the "green light" for the adoption of new electoral laws in the union and autonomous republics. And it is necessary to provide the opportunity for the adoption of republican laws even before the draft law we are examining today is ratified by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

At first glance the constitutional amendments submitted for your examination are not very many in number. But if you look at their content, it will become clear that the adoption of the amendments will make it possible considerably to extend the autonomy of union and autonomous republics regarding the legislative regulation of the electoral system and the whole procedure for holding elections.

The documents before you are unusual first and foremost in that, in formulating them, the approaches laid down by the union republics in the course of the drafting of new republican and electoral laws were carefully taken into account. The examination of these draft laws by the republic Supreme Soviets is planned, in the main, for the remaining days of October and November. And the proposed changes to the union Constitution specifically accumulate the results of the republics' own creative work. What is happening is a kind of interweaving, a mutual enrichment, of union and republican legislation. This is undoubtedly a positive trend that accords with the principles of our federation. The center draws on the republics' lawmaking activity, while the republics proceed from the fundamental principles of the union Constitution, principles which are worked out in the country's highest organ of power by the joint efforts of representatives of all the republics.

I must say that the commission formed by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to prepare the draft law had a lot of work to do. The commission included representatives of all the union republics, USSR people's deputies, and leading scholars specializing in the state system. In the summer, as you know, there was a wide-ranging conference of chairmen of the Supreme Soviet Presidiums of union and autonomous republics on questions of the revision of electoral legislation.

On 20 October the draft law prepared with the participation of the republics was discussed in detail at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Every amendment and every addition to the Constitution was reexamined here. Considerations put forward by the chairmen of all the Supreme Soviet committees and commissions of the chambers were examined.

What specific constitutional changes are we talking about?

First and foremost, they are changes aimed at eliminating the excessively strict specification in the union Constitution of the system of representative organs of state power in the republics. As you know, Articles 12 and 13 of the USSR Constitution state that Congresses of People's Deputies and Supreme Soviets, as the highest component of power, are formed at the level of the USSR and in each union and autonomous republic. In formulating the constitutional amendments it was necessary first and foremost to take into account the fact that certain union republics, such as the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], judging by the draft laws being drawn up locally, are also planning to create their own Congresses of People's Deputies and Supreme Soviets. Other republics plan to have only Supreme Soviets. Nor, as you know, is the system of local organs of power absolutely identical in all the republics.

On this basis, it is proposed to clarify Articles 89, 91, 137, 143, and 145 of the USSR Constitution.

Thus the new version of Articles 89 and 91 will not now stipulate the obligatory formation of Congresses of People's Deputies of union republics. These articles—and the same goes for Article 143—will also not mention the creation of Congresses of People's Deputies of autonomous republics.

At the same time it is proposed to delete from Article 89 the naming of specific components of the system of local soviets, and not to include an exhaustive list of these components in Article 145. This is being done in order to allow for the possibility of the formation of soviets in other administrative-territorial units formed in accordance with the laws of union and autonomous republics.

In view of the possible different ways of forming the presidiums of soviets in the republics, it is proposed to clarify the provisions of Article 91 on this point. In some republics the Presidiums, by analogy with the union organ, will consist of the officials listed in the Constitution, as is the intention, for instance, in the Russian Federation. But in, for instance, the Lithuanian SSR this principle will be combined with the possibility of electing other people to the Presidium too. A version whereby the Supreme Soviet will elect its entire Presidium is also possible. That is why the new version of Article 91 uses the general term "Presidiums are formed."

In Articles 138 and 144 of the USSR Constitution it is proposed to avoid going into excessive detail on questions connected with the highest organs of state power and management of union and autonomous republics. Only the most necessary, basic provisions on the system for these organs will remain in these articles.

Thus, far greater opportunities are opened up for the republics' autonomously to define in their own Constitutions the system of highest and local organs of state power.

It must be mentioned specifically that the deletion from the USSR Constitution of the mention of Congresses of People's Deputies as an obligatory element of the highest component of power of the union republics and the granting to the republics of the opportunity to resolve this question autonomously does not, of course, mean that the idea of Congresses is itself being called into question. The implementation of this idea in practice and the formation of a dual highest component of state power in the form of the Congress and Supreme Soviet of the USSR demonstrate a realistic way of combining broad representation with the exercise of executive, legislative, and monitoring functions. And in forming their own power structure, distinct from the union structure, the republics must obviously bear in mind these general principles of the structure of the Soviet form of full people's power.

In this connection it should be noted that proposals on establishing a post of president of the republic or chairman of the soviet to be elected by the population independently of the Supreme Soviet did not meet with majority support, either in the commission to prepare the draft law, or at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session. And this is not a question of the name, the formalistic aspect. It is a question of the substance. The direct election of the chairman of the soviet by the population and the establishment of presidential power would mean the emergence of an official independent of a representative organ, which is in fact contrary to the very idea of full power for the soviets, the principles on which they are built, and the integrity of their system.

The proposed constitutional amendments also concern the timing and procedure for setting elections. Article 90 of the Constitution now in force stipulates that elections of people's deputies are to be set no later than 4 months before the expiration of the term of office of the corresponding organs of state power. This applies to soviets at all levels, although naturally in the holding of elections in the republics this period may be different. And that is indeed how a number of republics are formulating it in their draft laws. Therefore it is proposed to preserve the requirement for a 4-month period in the USSR Constitution only for elections of USSR people's deputies. As for the timing and procedure for setting elections in the republics, they will have the right to decide this for themselves in their Constitutions and electoral laws.

Different approaches are also emerging in the republican draft laws on a question of some significance, namely the representation of social organizations on the highest organs of power. Some republics advocate the direct representation of social organizations. (They are the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and Moldavia.) Here it is proposed to elect one-fourth of the people's deputies of the republic directly from republican social organizations. Other republics advocate the holding of elections only by electoral okrugs. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium believes that each republic can and should resolve this question autonomously.

In view of this, it is proposed to clarify the norms of the USSR Constitution in such a way as to rule out neither version. To this end it is considered expedient to specify in Article 95 that alongside elections by okrugs, a proportion of USSR People's deputies and also a proportion of people's deputies of union and autonomous republics—if the republics' constitutions so stipulate—are elected from social organizations.

The procedure for holding elections of people's deputies, as Article 101 of the USSR Constitution states, is defined by the laws of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics. This also applies to elections of deputies from social organizations. Therefore it is proposed to delete from Articles 95, 96, 97, and 98 the mention of elections from social organizations.

Here I would like to note that the proposed amendments do not by any means amount to a negation of the actual principle of representation of social organizations. It is only a question of enshrining in the Constitution various channels for ensuring such representation.

Be that as it may, the practice of representation from social organizations, irrespective of the methods of electing deputies, shows convincingly that such representation considerably enriches the potential of our organs of power. The implementation of this principle ensures the fuller expression in the soviets of the will and interests of all strata of the population and all social institutions participating in political life. All this has to be taken into account in constitutional legislation.

Another question of some importance on which a change to the union constitution is required involves the republics' different approaches to the fate of okrug election meetings. Uzbekistan, for instance, advocates keeping them, but clarifies their powers. In the Russian Federation it is planned to hold okrug election meetings in the event that more than 10 candidates are nominated for the okrug in elections of people's deputies of the republic, or more than 5 candidates in elections of local soviet deputies. At least two candidates must then be submitted for registration.

Other republics consider it inappropriate to hold okrug meetings during elections to local soviets, but advocate retaining them for elections of republic people's deputies (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan). still others want to abandon these meetings altogether.

So as not to impose a rigid framework on the republics, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium proposes to delete entirely from Article 100 of the union Constitution the provision on okrug election meetings. Thus the republics will resolve this question for themselves.

Another thing. It is deemed expedient to take another step aimed at extending opportunities for young people to participate in the elections. To this end it is planned to grant the right to nominate candidate people's deputies to collectives of secondary specialized and higher educational institutions and to guarantee these collectives the right to participate in electoral commissions and in election campaigning (Articles 100, 101). This decision was prompted by the experience of the last elections. Some republics have already made provision for an analogous or similar formula in their own draft laws.

The last election campaign suggested the need to add to the Constitution a fundamental provision aimed at ensuring that all candidate people's deputies are able to participate in the election campaign on equal terms (Article 100). We know that by no means all the candidates had equal conditions in the course of the elections. It happened not infrequently that it was not the candidate's personal qualities, but the propagandist and material and technical resources of his election campaign that formed a decisive factor in the victory. Unequal conditions and one-sided advantages are in no way in accordance with the principles of socialist democracy and social justice.

It must be mentioned particularly that in the course of the discussion of the draft law in the commission and at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session the view was expressed that it is necessary to include in Article 100 of the USSR Constitution a provision whereby the number of candidates included on the ballot papers must be greater than the number of deputies' seats available.

The majority of the participants in the discussion did not, however, agree with this amendment, and came out in favor of not restricting the right of the voters themselves to decide the question of the number of candidates included on the ballot paper. In view of this, the text of the Constitution retains the existing norm on the possibility of including any number of candidates on the ballot paper. This norm, as many comrades noted, is more democratic. Furthermore it is necessary to take into account the fact that many republics plan to change the powers of election meetings, or to adopt a decision not to hold them at all.

And another matter. This concerns the limit of two terms in office for persons elected or appointed by the soviets, stipulated in Article 91. An important and necessary principle. Taking into account, however, the specific characteristics of judicial work and at the same time the increased guarantees of the independence of judges, it is proposed not to extend this principle to them, making a corresponding stipulation in Article 91.

That is the "package" of changes and additions proposed for incorporation in the USSR Constitution.

As you know, constitutional amendments are subject to ratification by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. That is its exclusive right. At the same time you know that in certain republics it is planned to hold elections to the soviets before the adoption by the Congress of the Law on Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution, and the elections must be set in good time.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium therefore considers that the republics must be given the opportunity to adopt their own electoral laws now.

From the legal viewpoint this is no easy task. It could be resolved, given the adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of a resolution approving the constitutional amendments. At the same time, with a view to accelerating the implementation of electoral reform, it is proposed that this resolution acknowledge the possibility of making changes to republican electoral legislation on the basis of the present union draft law, prior to its examination by the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The draft law and draft USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on this matter, as well as a comparative table showing the text of the constitution, are before you.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium requests that you examine them.

Deputies Discuss Lukyanov Report

LD2310115789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 23 Oct 89

[From the "Soyuz" program presented by Natalya Vartanyan]

[Text] The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing work. Our program includes a live report from the correspondents' studio in the Kremlin. Aleksandr Ruvinskiy, our correspondent, is at the microphone.

[Ruvinskiy] I can report that today's morning session is being chaired by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The deputies have devoted this session to discussion of the draft law on changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution with regard to the electoral system.

A report from the Supreme Soviet Presidium on this issue has been delivered by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. He noted that we are standing at the threshold of the second phase of creating a new political system of people's power. Furthermore, it is now a question of the largest sector—the local soviets and elections to the local soviet in some republics, as our listeners obviously already know, have been set for December, and in other republics for February or March.

Well now, the proposed draft plans making changes to several chapters in the constitution. These are Chapters 12, 13, 17, 18, and 19. They all concern the system and principles by which the peoples' deputies operate, as well as the election system itself. The draft proposes a departure from setting things out in excesive detail and giving the republics themselves maximum opportunities to determine the procedure for elections as well as many other matters. Changes to 15 articles in the constitution are proposed in all.

After Comrade Lukyanov had delivered his report, he was asked many questions about this draft. They concerned elections from the public organizations role of district election commissions, the election or formation of presidia of republican Supreme Soviets, the election of presidents of republics, the role of young people in the election campaign, and spending on the election campaign.

After this a debate began. It was opened by Deputy Shapovalenko. He categorically opposed electing deputies from public organizations. Deputy Pukhova, who spoke after him, objected to what he said. She noted that this would encroach on women's rights and cited the examples of other states where women have a fixed quota allocated to them. The next to speak was Deputy Ryabchenko. He adopted the view that elections from public organizations could be applied in practice, but that all members of these organizations should vote and not just their leading bodies.

The discussion is continuing. So far three deputies have spoken in the debate. But let me remind you that the Supreme Soviet itself cannot adopt amendments to the Constitution. It can only submit them for examination by the Congress.

There is now a break at the session.

Lukyanov Responds to Deputy

LD2310131889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 23 Oct 89

["At the Supreme Soviet" program, presented by Andrey Nikiforov]

[Excerpts] Good afternoon, esteemed comrade listeners! This morning in the Kremlin, the USSR Supreme Soviet session resumed its proceedings. The joint session of the chambers is being chaired by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. For the consideration of the deputies, the draft law on changes and additions to the Constitution of the

USSR regarding the questions of the election system has been submitted. A specially formed commission has worked for a long time to prepare this bill, and last week it submitted its proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Taking part in its work, incidentally, were all the chairmen of committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet. The Presidium has formulated final proposals about the bill in question, and today, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov has delivered a report on this matter. I wish to offer for your attention an extract from his speech: [passage omitted]

Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov answered the deputies' questions, one of which was put forth by Deputy Sobchak:

[Begin recording] [Sobchak] Our discussion of a whole series of laws on ownership, land, taxation and leasing relations has given rise to the necessity to introduce serious amendments to the USSR Constitution on the issues in question, that is, on issues relating to the economic system and so on. We now propose that the Supreme Soviet should examine the issue of introducing amendments to the electoral system alone and of how we shall examine the matter of introducing amendments to other sections of the Constitution which should be introduced at the same time as these laws at the Congress.

[Lukyanov] This issue did of course occupy our attention when we were discussing the agenda. Only the draft law on amendments and addenda to the Constitution on issues relating to the electoral system was included on the Supreme Soviet agenda, as you recall, and this was the instruction of the first Congress of People's Deputies. However, each of you who has had held the draft law on ownership has seen that affixed to this law is also the draft law on amending four major articles of the Constitution. Every one of you who also receives the draft law on Constitutional Supervision will also see that this proposes—the commission is of this opinion—the necessity of amending the Constitution. That is, by the time of the Congress, we shall arrive at a larger number of amendments to the Constitution. But each time we shall prepare a draft law which will, when adopted, simultaneously approve the draft law on amendments to the Constitution, in parts, so to speak. All these will be gathered together at the Congress of People's Deputies for amendment. On a general note, at the same time preparation is also under way—there are several versions of this already—of the draft of a new USSR Constitution, in which all these amendments should find reflection in a unified context, so to speak. [end recording]

The discussion on the draft law is continuing at the session, and we shall tell you how it is proceeding in our subsequent bulletins.

Further on Debate

PM2410103589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by V. Romanyuk and A. Stepovoy: "Fulfilling Congress' Instructions"]

[Text] The morning joint sitting of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities was opened by M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On the agenda was the draft law on changes and additions to the USSR Constitution on questions of the electoral system. A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, delivered the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium report.

After the report A.I. Lukyanov answered numerous questions from the deputies.

During the discussion which developed great attention was paid to ensuring equal rights for candidates to conduct election agitation, especially from the viewpoint of their material and technical and propaganda opportunities. Keen debates were generated by the question of the possibility of holding direct elections of the Supreme Soviet chairman or the republic's president. In the opinion of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, direct elections will lead to the unjustified redistribution of power inasmuch as a new post will appear that is not subordinated to the Supreme Soviet—that restricts the power of the people.

M.S. Gorbachev delivered a rejoinder on this question. He stressed that it is not a case of the procedure for electing the Supreme Soviet chairman or president but of a change in the nature of power. Society has not fully joined in the political process, its politicization has only begun. And the transition to presidential rule would mean a departure from true power of the people for the soviets.

After the intermission USSR People's Deputies B.N. Nikolskiy, V.A. Rogozhina, A.M. Yemelyanov, V.I. Samarin, and B.F. Pylin took part in the discussion on this question of the agenda.

A number of deputies expressed themselves in favor of holding free referendums on fundamental questions of the power of the people making it possible to consider the opinion of the broadest people's masses.

It was proposed that the draft law on changes and additions to the USSR Constitution on questions of the electoral system be examined and that after examination in the Supreme Soviet Presidium—in conjunction with the commissions and committees—it be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet for examination.

But Deputy Yu.N. Shcherbak, who spoke next, expressed the wish that work on this draft law be accelerated by every means. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session opens 25 October and will adopt republican legislation on this question. The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet session opens the same day.

Deputy B.N. Yeltsin suggested that the session's work be broken off and that the examination of the draft be embarked upon immediately in the committees and commissions so that they can be submitted next day for examination to the Supreme Soviet. The proposal, supported by a number of deputies, was accepted.

USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze delivered information on the work of the USSR Foreign Ministry in implementing the basic avenues of the USSR's foreign policy.

Gorbachev on Electoral Changes

LD2410015889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1843 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Remarks by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, at the Supreme Soviet session on 23 October in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] I simply want to respond to the discussion on this issue [of the electoral system]. The discussion, I think, is in keeping with the scale of the problem we are discussing. The question at issue is a very important one relating to matters connected with the second stage of implementation of political reform.

As you recall, when we initially discussed this issue in the Supreme Soviet, we agreed that some kind of all-Union normative bases are necessary in order to give a certain orientation, a certain character to the forthcoming elections of republican and local soviets. At the time we came to an agreement, although there was discussion of whether all this should be perhaps handed over for the consideration of the republics. Everyone, however, advocated that fundamental principles, so to speak, should be enshrined here, at the level of the center, the supreme bodies of power of our federation. At that time we sought an option, and in my view opted for the correct one: that Article 13 of the USSR Constitution on the electoral system must be analyzed, taking into account the elections of USSR people's deputies that have taken place, and the lessons arising from this political campaign. This is, essentially, how we proceeded. A great deal of work has been done, and we opted for those proposals which have been submitted for your consideration. This, I think, is the correct way; I think this is indeed the correct way, and it has in general enabled us to think through the preceding election campaign thoroughly. That is the first thing.

Second, both the discussion which preceded the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the discussion in the Supreme Soviet Presidium, as well as today's discussion in the Supreme Soviet, demonstrate that further in-depth work needs to be done on the document so that we can fully clear up the issues which give rise to anxiety among our public and among the deputies themselves. It thus seems to me that the proposal that this work be continued in committees and commissions is correct.

And third, a discussion has started here again which regularly crops up, or periodically crops up in society, both in the party and in society as a whole; that is, about a president [prezident], about a chairman [predsedatel] of the Soviet, and so forth. You will recall that this discussion got fully and very broadly under way for the first time at the 19th party conference. I think, comrades, that we acted correctly then in regard to this issue, in order to develop our position from positions of principle. This is no procedural matter; nor is it simply relating to the way in which elections and the election campaign are conducted. It is a question of the nature of power. Either we continue the Leninist tradition and preserve the soviets and return power to them, as we have begun to do, and we are doing it thoroughly. [sentence as heard] I am convinced that it is possible to do that, regardless of all the errors, blunders, and expense. I think that in general we are going in the right direction regarding general strategy.

The next stage will help us to complete the task of handing over power to the soviets. What I mean is the stage involving the formation of republican bodies of power and local soviets. This will perhaps be the most important event since the October Revolution, or at least one of the most important. That's how I would put it. Because without the sort of superstructure that transforms our soviets into true bodies of people's power it is difficult to count on perestroyka being successful in all directions, primarily regarding the economy and other directions.

So I am convinced that we are on the right road. If, comrades, we are talking about a president then what should we do? Will we be setting up a presidential system of authority, a presidential system of administration? What sort will it be? Will it be the U.S. system, or the French system? Well then, are we going to have chairmen of the soviets who will be like governors with whom everyone else only acts as advisers but who play no real role?

But isn't it too early for us to do that? We haven't yet really involved society in the political process, haven't yet developed these mechanisms for truly realizing the potential of our people. Just look at how it has responded, how our society has become politicized. While experiencing a certian degree of inconvenience and finding things less comfortable we must mainly rejoice at this. I believe that in the heat of the moment we may make a mess of things by casting aside the soviets which were born, so to speak, before the revolution and which gained their support subsequently, and by setting off along the path of switching to presidential power.

Perhaps this impresses some people. Perhaps there are people who would again like to have—and we hear such voices— some sort of savior for the homeland. However, I do not think we need a savior of the homeland of the likes we have already seen.

It is in those power structures which genuinely bring out into the political arena the people as the main character that our salvation lies. If this comes to pass from the bottom right to the top, we have a guarantee that there will not only be no cult, but also no cult followers. There will be no patrimony anywhere. Everything will be in the hands of the people. Therefore, in my opinion, we are going in the right direction.

But all this about doing it all at once, experimenting and so on —here, comrades, we are dealing with an issue of principle, concerning the changing of the nature of power. We cannot do it all at once, sitting like this in a session or sitting in committee. This is all-in-all a serious issue. I think we should complete—since we have taken this road—carry out the new stage, the successive stage of the political reform. We shall see and take a look at what kind of thing it is, publicize all this and consider whether we have achieved all that we have been counting on in choosing political reform, or whether, by drawing lessons from it, we should arrive at the finding that after all, we have to go back and formulate this issue in a different way. But we shall have time to look at it, discuss it, see what kind of thing it is, so to speak. So I would not oversimplify this issue, comrades. When all is said and done, it is up to the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies to express a point of view. That is their prerogative. But, to my mind, let us approach such issues concerning the nature of power and treat them in a very serious manner—a very serious one. I think that so far we have been proceeding in the right direction, even considering all the losses and costs, even considering everything that we have seen, that here and there things have not quite worked out right, but our direction is correct.

I would not reduce all this business, so to speak, not oversimplify this thing. So let us first complete that which we have started and draw conclusions whether things have worked out as we had planned or whether we need a different approach. But if you and I, without having completed our work already, start doubting it, I think we could very seriously destabilize the political process, the situation, and altogether undermine the perestroyka process as a whole. Well, I think that everything you have said and the response I decided to make, all this is something to think about when these issues are debated in commissions and committees, and then they are going to come back to the Supreme Soviet again.

If you have no objections, it would be possible to adopt a short decision like this: The Supreme Soviet decides to accept for examination a USSR draft law on changes and additions to the constitution, the basic law of the USSR; second, to instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, since we have instructed it previously, jointly with the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the commissions of its chambers to examine the proposals and remarks made by USSR people's deputies and to present a further elaborated bill to the USSR Supreme Soviet; and also to note that all republics are preparing and working on the basis of this document on which we are reaching agreement but are putting their own laws into operation as well as their own constitutional amendments after they have been adopted by the Congress of People's Deputies. But let the commissions ponder this. There are several proposals here, but this whole process must be examined.

[Nikiforov] The deputies voted and decided to accept the proposed bill for examination and as a matter of urgency to start further elaborating it in the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet. It was decided that this work will continue this afternoon and tomorrow morning. At 1400 [1100 GMT] tomorrow the joint session of both chambers will resume, at which deputies will return to the bill on changes and additions to the constitution on the electoral system.

Debate Summed Up

LD2310145489 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 23 Oct 89

["Supreme Soviet Session—Round-up for October 23"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Supreme Soviet today began discussing amendments to the national constitution which should pave the way to democratic elections to republican and local governing councils. Democratic general elections last spring were made possible by constitutional changes effected late last year.

Presenting a bill on the new amendments, First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov said they should perceptibly broaden the independence of constituent republics in the regulation of the electoral system. They would also formalise some general principles for organising elections and the power structure.

The ensuing debate focussed on two issues: The representation of mass organisations and the election of the chairman of a governing council.

Originally, it had been provided to extend the principle of elections to the Congress of People's Deputies (two-thirds of whom are elected by the electorate and the other one-third by mass organisations) to cover the lower echelons of power as well. But many insisted that all deputies without exception must be elected directly by constituents.

A number of deputies also argued that council chairmen should be elected directly by voters by secret ballot rather than by council members, as is now the case. Some said that constituent republics should be led by presidents.

Commenting on these views, Mikhail Gorbachev said the issue involves the nature of power in the country. Without soviets, or elected governing councils, it is hard to count on a successful perestroyka. The transition to a presidential form of administration will lead to the appearance of powerful rulers with only their aides and advisers in the governing team, he explained.

"We don't need the saviors of the nation of the kind that we have already witnessed," Gorbachev stressed. He said the way out is to create power structures where people will play the decisive role.

As a result of the debate, the deputies instructed the Supreme Soviet Presidium to review and finalise the bill jointly with parliamentary commissions and committees. They hope that the vote will be held as early as Tuesday.

In the afternoon today the Supreme Soviet heard Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on his ministry's performance.

Shevardnadze 23 Oct Foreign Policy Report

PM2410093189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition pp 2-4

[Unattributed account of 23 October speech to plenary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze: "Foreign Policy and Perestroyka"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Chairman!

Esteemed Members of the Supreme Soviet!

The Foreign Ministry has prepared a review of Soviet foreign policy for the years 1985-1989. The practice that existed under V.I. Lenin, whereby the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs submitted annual reports to the Congress of Soviets, is being reinstated.

Please be generous toward this first experiment. It may not have proved successful in every respect.

But it has provided a picture of what has been done to implement the main directions of foreign policy.

Since this is my first speech at the Supreme Soviet, I cannot avoid raising a number of general problems. I ask for your understanding.

International activity is a vast sphere. The country's political leadership, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet, and the government not only determine the main avenues of policy, the line taken by the state, and its fundamental attitude to events in the world but also guide the work of many departments, establishments, and organizations linked with foreign affairs. Everything that has been achieved is the result of collective effort.

Before I touch on certain general problems relating to foreign policy, I would like to respond to requests from some deputies and assess the results of my recent talks in the United States, Nicaragua, and Cuba. The review that has been circulated contains information about specific aspects of these talks. So I will try to sum up my impressions and conclusions.

Both we and the Americans consider our conversations with President G. Bush and Secretary of State J. Baker important for our relations. Why?

During these talks we effectively decided where we are going and how fast. It turned out that, despite all the differences and divergences in political philosophy and outlook, both sides assess the current situation, view their priorities, and calculate their schedules for action in similar categories with an identical thrust.

There is the realization that conditions are ripe for taking a new and major step forward. The accord on a summit is a result of this.

It is important to stress that both the Soviet and U.S. leaderships are directing their attention to the long-term prospects for increasing positive and constructive cooperation in bilateral relations and on the whole series of world problems.

I cannot fail to note that Soviet-U.S. dialogue has scaled new heights in terms of openness, businesslike intensity, the breadth of the questions raised, and the degree of mutual understanding and amicability. The conversations in Washington and Wyoming took place in precisely that vein.

We were quite close to California. The calamity that befell its territory arouses pain and compassion in us. We would like to say this once again to the people of America and the inhabitants of the state who have suffered as a result of the earthquake.

For the first time a USSR foreign minister has visited Nicaragua. That is a country with which we are friendly and with whose people the Soviet Union feels profound sympathy.

The situation around Nicaragua is different now. The Sandinist leadership's flexible line and the activity carried out by the institution of the presidents of five countries of the region are bearing fruit. Washington is also displaying realism and giving precedence to a political settlement.

We attach great significance to the secretary of state's statement that the United States will accept any results of elections in Nicaragua provided those elections are "clean."

As is well known, Managua agreed to ensure that the February general elections take place under international supervision.

The joint decision we have taken with our friends to suspend our arms shipments to Nicaragua also contributes to stabilization.

We reckon that our talks with the Nicaraguan leadership were necessary and important from the viewpoint of the results they produced. They were characterized by a spirit of comradeliness and complete mutual understanding.

We had a thorough exchange of opinions on a broad range of questions in Havana with Comrade Fidel Castro and the members of the Cuban leadership. We informed our friends about our talks in the United States and in Nicaragua and also about the progress of perestroyka. Comrade Fidel showed tremendous interest in the processes taking place in our country and stressed the importance of the successful implementation of the aims of perestroyka for Cuba and the entire world.

The priority task in Soviet-Cuban relations is to improve the mechanism for economic cooperation and sharply boost its effectiveness and mutual advantageousness.

Substantial work lies ahead in this direction.

In connection with Cuba I would like to single out something that we said to the Americans: U.S. policy toward Cuba does not fit in with the current situation. It presents a very stark contrast against the general background of the warming of the international climate. The very terms "blockade" and "embargo" grate on one's ears. Washington should give some thought to the signal given by the world community when it elected Cuba a member of the UN Security Council.

If there are problems, they must be resolved through dialogue. As far as we know, the Cuban leadership is ready for this.

Given that the material we have distributed contains specific information which effectively relates to all aspects of our ministry's activity, I will venture to broach certain questions relating to the essence of foreign policy, its philosophy, aims, values, morality, and ethics.

It is these categories above all which are affected by what we describe as the new political thinking. This entails the sum total of our views and opinions of the world, the time, and ourselves. They emerged as the result of profound and thorough consideration of the meaning of life and the policy tasks in the new realities of civilization's existence. Understandably, by definition I am talking about an unending process of constant correlation between policy and reality.

That is why when we speak about the new political thinking, we are referring to both the method and the results of the work carried out in the foreign policy sphere in the period of perestroyka. The CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the 27th Party Congress, the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, and the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies were most important milestones in the elaboration and evolution of the new political thinking.

The ideas and principles of the new political thinking have been formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's speeches and in our state's foreign policy documents.

Our discussion of foreign policy takes place within a definite context—at a crucial stage of perestroyka, a turning point for our country's future.

Speaking recently in New York, I made so bold as to predict that the second session of the Supreme Soviet and the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies would be of particular significance for the development and—this is the main point—the consolidation of our society.

I am convinced that this is how it should be. Perestroyka has entered a phase in which the primary task is to enshrine through appropriate legislation those conceptual breakthroughs, changes of system, and progressive practical developments that have already been obtained as a result of the democratization of our society's life and the renewal of the socialist idea.

I deem it necessary to voice an opinion on the foreign policy aspects of perestroyka, because it is not only impossible but also extremely dangerous to divide domestic from foreign policy.

The notion that we can ignore the world around us and disregard other people's interests has cost our people and socialism dearly in the past.

One of the foundations of the new political thinking is the understanding of the high degree of unity and interdependence of the modern world. It is in a state of scomplex and fine balance between its component parts, an equilibrium of interests, and centripetal and centrifugal movements.

We often talk about the international significance of our perestroyka. But do we always realize what it really means for the world?

The diplomatic service has a right to express an opinion here since it is a special institution within the state system. Through it we firstly establish what the attitude is toward our country and toward what we are doing, not only outside but also at home. If we want to be part of a civilized world we must consider how our actions and words are perceived.

The diplomatic service can and should provide supreme organs of power with more prompt and precise information about those instances when our positions, approaches, and actions conflict with prevailing international opinions, legal norms, and moral and ethical standards.

Of course, it should provide warning signals when a situation arises that is fraught with serious consequences for the country and its future.

The processes occurring in one-sixth of the world cannot fail to make an impact on the situation in the world and cannot fail to be a subject of interest and the object of attention for other countries. These processes bear a direct relation to mankind's destiny and chances of survival in conditions which confront us with unprecedented challenges and threats—nuclear, ecological, demographic, and economic.

People pin on our perestroyka hopes for peace, the resolution of global problems. And an improvement in general prosperity.

This may flatter our national pride, and it irritates some people. But it is a fact.

We must also realize that other people's attitude to events in our country will shape our political and even physical surroundings.

The concept of perestroyka, its ideas and ideals enjoy the widespread and sincere support of the world community. I am speaking immediately in the wake of my conversations with the presidents, premiers, and ministers of almost 70 countries with whom I had meetings in New York. Indeed, there is visual confirmation of this. Suffice it to recall the way M.S. Gorbachev has been greeted on the streets of Delhi, Washington, Beijing, Bonn, and other capitals. The pronouncements made by state leaders in favor of perestroyka are well known.

Many people's deputies have made tours abroad, met with politicians, business people, and representatives of working people and the intelligentsia, and have heard their opinions on this score.

We all know about the concern in the world about certain processes in our domestic life and the imbalances between critical and constructive work.

But serious politicians are sure that our perestroyka is not a temporary phenomenon, and that its goals will be achieved. I would say that they are staking a lot on this and are making long-term political investments.

We are currently conducting frank discussions and are not afraid to talk about our difficulties and problems. And people are not afraid to tell us what they think about our perestroyka.

Its concept and thrust, and the ways of implementing it—through democratization, glasnost, and dialogue—are considered to be correct. People note the reliable foundation of perestroyka—our people's intellectual and spiritual riches, the high level of development of all nationalities inhabiting the country and of all regions, the existence of a pretty big production potential, a literate and skilled workforce, and a ramified modern scientific infrastructure, not to mention our natural resources.

On the basis of an analysis of external factors I make so bold as to voice the opinion that nothing will now be more useful for obtaining tangible results from the transformations and reforms than a period of stable, organized, and intensive work.

The draft laws under examination by the Supreme Soviet are of enormous international importance too. This applies above all to such acts as the Law on Ownership. It is, without exaggeration, a key element in a rule-of-law state. The fact that we embarked on drawing up this law attests to a different and incomparably higher level of political maturity and political standards.

The adoption of the Law on Ownership and the other basic legislative acts associated with it is a necessary prerequisite for the Soviet Union's broad participation in the international division of labor and for the compatibility of our economy with the world economic system.

For the first time our country can have a budget and development plan that are really geared to the people's interests and their well-being, and to the social sphere in general. These budget and plan priorities create the conditions for the development of international cooperation and the implementation of foreign policy steps which will work for the success of perestroyka, the improvement of Soviet people's lives, and the launching of our country into the ranks of the most advanced states.

I say this not only as a Communist and a citizen, but also because it is now in general impossible to talk about a serious foreign policy or the country's position in the world in isolation from perestroyka and its problems and prospects.

Perestroyka is presenting our foreign policy with immense tasks. These lie in assimilating different directives, upholding more progressive principles, preventing any divergence between words and actions, and changing the style and methods of our work.

Perestroyka is raising once again the question of the place of socialism and the country in the world, of the correlation of various interests, and of priorities and values. In other words, it predetermines the need for a fundamentally different foreign policy.

But the reception given to this policy and the external response to it depend directly on the consistency and irreversibility of perestroyka.

Here I would like to state my opinion on the genesis and evolution of perestroyka. It was historically inevitable. This inevitability nonetheless proved possible to implement under definite conditions—first and foremost, the readiness of society as a whole to accept it and society's consent as regards the parameters of possible changes.

Two "thaws" failed to grow into extensive renewal because such consent was lacking. But there had been no shortage of the two other important elements: the coming to the leadership in the party and the country of a generation which had not been involved in the well-known deformations and refused to accept them, and confidence in the country's external security.

I cannot agree with the opinion expressed at one large party forum that completely different decisions could have been reached in the March 1985 election of the new general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. There could simply have been no other choice. And this was essentially the choice of the entire party. M.S. Gorbachev appeared in the party's leading organs under the pressure of the demands of the time as a leader of that generation of Soviet people which was to shoulder the task of transforming the country.

The Soviet Union's foreign policy position was the second factor. In the fifties and sixties there were different realities and different ideas about the external threat. There was no sense of firm national security, and the threat of war was seen as an immediate and even inevitable reality. This could not fail to restrict the very scale of possible reform. It was necessary to acquire confidence and to eschew, if you will, our weakness complex so as to assess the situation objectively in a balanced way.

But the main difference nonetheless undoubtedly lay in the level of the involvement of party and people in the renewal processes. The 19th Party Conference and the activities of the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet reveal most clearly the fundamental difference between past practice and current practice. This is the basis for our optimism and faith in the success of the great cause initiated by the party and the people.

Perestroyka faces considerable difficulties, but today we can guarantee that it is irreversible. This is very important for foreign policy.

We can talk about common human interests, confident that our country sees its main interest in combining the national and the common human aspects.

We can talk about the democratization of international relations, knowing that we ourselves are living in a democratic and rule-of-law society and are gearing ourselves to the highest standards of democracy.

We can talk about the humanization of international relations as representatives of a country preaching humanism in its practice.

We can talk about a nonviolent world and the triumph of the force of right over the right of force, relying on the rule-of-law nature of the Soviet state and its adherence to the rejection of the use of force within the country.

Foreign policy can be effective if the values and principles it upholds are also an organic part of the state's domestic policy. Interdependence and the unity of what it does internally and externally ultimately determine a state's position in the community of nations.

The hearings at the Committee on International Affairs expressed the wish that the Foreign Ministry become more actively involved in solving internal problems. This is a very important and fundamental issue for us. It addresses the problems of the mission and duty of diplomacy. What are they? They are, of course, to pursue policy and defend the state's interests. But they are also to shape correct and moral impressions of the state's policy and interests.

I stress the word **moral**. Political decisions and acts of diplomacy may seem pragmatically advantageous, but if they are immoral they can never in any way be justified or correspond to the interests of the people and the state. We will not talk about the past. I now cannot imagine Soviet diplomacy not protesting loudly or not conducting an uncompromising struggle in those cases when it is convinced that a forthcoming statement, action, or agreement will damage the country's interests or reputation. It is not enough in such cases to voice opinions or warn of the consequences. We must do everything demanded by our party, civic, and professional consciences, and our human morality. And there can be no question of breaking the law, whatever the justification.

As a minister, I will carry out any legitimate decision, while reserving, however, the right to resign when I cannot agree with it out of political or moral considerations.

The new political thinking has made us adopt a different scale of evaluations and criteria of our own behavior. We have declared that we will be guided by common human values. These values are not an abstraction. They exist and cannot be interpreted arbitrarily or selectively.

A guiding star in this regard is provided by generally recognized documents, primarily the UN Charter and the declarations, pacts, conventions, and resolutions adopted and observed by the overwhelming majority of world states.

When more than 100 UN members kept condemning our action for a number of years, did we need anything else to make us realize: We had placed ourselves in opposition to the world community, had violated norms of behavior, and gone against common human interests.

I am of course talking about the introduction of troops into Afghanistan. There is a lesson to be learned from the fact that in this case too there were also gross violations of our own legislation and of our own intraparty and civic norms and ethics.

I am saying this as someone who was a candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo at that time. M.S. Gorbachev and I happened to be together at the time, and we learned about it from radio and newspaper reports. A decision which had grave consequences for our country was made behind the party's and the people's back. They were presented with a fait accompli.

We live in a real world where force is unfortunately still being used. The UN Charter recognizes the right to individual and collective defense and allows military assistance to another state. But the charter rigidly regulates such actions and demands that nonmilitary methods, the potential of the UN Organization itself, and other means of political solution be used as much as possible.

The development of events following the withdrawal of our troops indicates the ability of Afghan national forces to shoulder responsibility for their country's future.

Allow me in this context to note the role played by President Najibullah. A true patriot of his motherland, he was the first among Afghan leaders to advocate an Afghan solution to Afghanistan's problems and a withdrawal of Soviet troops. Deputies must know that, as far back as M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with the Afghan leadership in the fall of 1985, our side spoke of the need to withdraw our military contingent.

Najibullah initiated the elaboration of the policy of national reconciliation. His courage and political maturity proved decisive factors making it possible to elaborate the agreement on a political settlement in Geneva.

Together with V.A. Kryuchkov and other comrades, I visited Kabul on seven occasions and I know how hard it was to arrive at the Geneva accords and how helpful the president and his closest associates were in this regard.

We are also grateful to the Afghan leadership for its efforts to help us find out what has happened to Soviet soldiers who went missing in action or were captured, and to bring them back home.

Regardless of the personal attitude of each of us toward the decision to send in the troops, our attitude toward the guys who served in Afghanistan must be imbued with most profound respect and gratitude. Diplomats also had to wage a hard and heavy struggle in connection with Afghanistan in their own way, and we can well appreciate the feelings of the "Afgantsy" [Afghan war veterans] guys who sometimes encounter even unfriendly attitudes.

Our society still owes a debt to the dead, the physically and morally maimed, and their families, relatives, and friends, it owes a debt to all who have been scorched by this war's flames.

It would be only just for us to find a way to perpetuate the memory of "Afgantsy" officers and soldiers.

We must approach the question of providing aid to Afghanistan within this same context. No matter how hard it may be for us, we are not morally entitled to deny support to the Afghan people. If we did so, this would devalue all the sacrifices made by our people.

I believe and have no doubts that the people of Afghanistan will reach consensus regarding the representation of all patriotic forces in the government and that peace will be established in our neighbor country.

While changing many elements in our approach toward international relations, we cannot overlook the prevailing system of mutual commitments.

The observance of treaties, agreements, and contracts is one of the fundamental principles of international law.

Our relations with a number of states are governed by the existence of alliance treaty commitments, including commitments of a military-political nature.

We have treaties of friendship and cooperation with a large group of countries. We have trade, consular, cultural, and other agreements with almost all states.

We also have commitments of a different sort—moral commitments to our friends with whom we have marched shoulder to shoulder for years and even decades, with whom we have shared our bread and salt, as it were.

They supported us at the most difficult times—let us be blunt—even when we were in the wrong. They made sacrifices for our sake.

But new nuances have emerged in our relations. Voices can be heard calling for old friends to be spurned, or simply exchanged for new ones. Bluntly speaking, such recommendations are not very wise. But even this is not the point.

As I see it, the new thinking primarily implies eternal values like honesty, loyalty, and decency.

We have financial and economic commitments to a number of states. We must honor them. If we wish to change something—and changes are certainly necessary in many cases—then talks must be held with the other side regarding the new conditions.

Unilateral measures cannot fail to affect the country's reputation and faith in its word.

The Soviet Union is party to a great number of multilateral conventions, pacts, and agreements. They impose certain limitations, demand observance of standards and procedures, and provide for the payment of dues.

Current legislation assigns to the Foreign Ministry the task of monitoring the Soviet Union's fulfillment of international treaties. As a rule, the ministry participates in the elaboration of acts submitted for examination by the Supreme Soviet. It is important to rule out any possibility of introducing into these documents amendments diverging from our international commitments.

In its practical activity, the ministry pays paramount attention to relations with the Warsaw Pact countries and the socialist states.

Historic, qualitative changes have occurred here. We are building our relations with them on the basis of sovereign equality, impermissibility of any interference, and recognition of every country's right to absolute freedom of choice.

But it is precisely here that Soviet diplomacy has to effect a most profound perestroyka in essence, in its methods and style.

The ministry is aware of the responsibility and complexity of the task of transferring the entire package of ties with socialist, friendly, and sympathetic [blizkimi nam] countries to new principles. We are lagging behind, we are not doing enough work in this regard.

New alternative forces are emerging onto the political arena in some of them. It is not that somebody is introducing these forces. They are emerging because the people want this. And these states are not ceasing to be neighbors, allies, and friends of ours.

All our commitments remain in force.

One thing is clear: It is no longer possible to act within the old structures that took shape in the past. Economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation must be placed on a new footing. We understand our friends' desire to have diverse, extensive links with the whole world. We ourselves are traveling this path.

We are now passing through a very crucial and delicate stage. The situation is not easy, but we are not overdramatizing it.

There are problems both large and small, there are complexities in our relations with the fraternal countries, but there is no crisis in them.

The most difficult thing is the perestroyka of the mechanisms of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. Here, in our opinion, there is a need for statewide efforts and the participation of many departments and organizations.

I would like to single out the steady progress in relations with the PRC since their complete normalization.

We must approach relations with this great socialist power solicitously, with great consideration.

The past must not repeat itself.

Objective analysis confirms that in the past not everything was done to avert the break with China, to alleviate the conflict, and to prevent confrontation and clashes.

Both the Soviet and the Chinese peoples paid a high price for the decades of alienation. Tens of billions of rubles and colossal resources were spent on creating an "infrastructure for confrontations."

Unfortunately, not everyone appreciates what relations with other states, with the outside world, mean. They do not always realize the difference in price between a bad foreign policy and a good one. Yet the difference is huge from the viewpoint of economic and human consequences.

A deterioration in relations with any country costs a lot of money; confrontation can, without exaggeration, ruin a country.

A sensible foreign policy is a direct contribution to the country's prosperity and to the emotional and physical health of every nation, every family, and every person.

It has to be admitted that you often hear—I will be blunt—a very philistine "question": What is the use of diplomats? Incompetent ones are indeed of little use. That is why it is so important to have a competent diplomatic service and to show respect for the diplomat's profession and labor.

I am not going to speak about the state of relations with individual countries, about regional policy, or about the positions at the talks. All those topics are mentioned in the review.

I would ask the people's deputies to note the section devoted to India. We have special relations with India—close and trusting in nature, broad and full in substance. It can be said with every justification that they are an important factor in world politics today. For instance, the Delhi declaration was a major milestone in the evolution of the new thinking.

These years have been a period of exceptionally great activeness on our part in the European sphere. The contacts between state and government leaders which resulted in major political statements and accords were of determining significance here.

Today it is generally recognized that a breakthrough has been achieved in developing the Helsinki process. There is a high degree of consensus regarding its further advancement on the basis of the idea of building an all-European home.

It is also possible to speak of a qualitatively higher level of trust and of encouraging prospects for resolving security questions and expanding cooperation in Europe.

We are gladdened by the considerable positive changes in relations with Indonesia, Iran, Egypt, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and many other countries on all continents.

We attach great importance to the strengthening positive trends in political relations with Japan.

Among the ministry's more specific and urgent spheres of work I would highlight:

—the elaboration of a just not only political but also international economic order and a solution to the problems of indebtedness, of switching resources to development needs, and of converting military production. Here it is appropriate to recall M.S. Gorbachev's thought that the Soviet Union can become a laboratory of experience of conversion;

—the creation of conditions for taking part in the international division of labor and membership of the

World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, GATT, and other financial and economic institutions;

—the organization of international cooperation with a view to protecting and conserving the environment. There is a wide band of green in the spectrogram of Soviet diplomacy. A new sphere may be arising in politics—political ecology;

—the establishment of contact with our compatriots abroad. There are 20 million of them—a whole country! Many of them are not there of their own choosing. The Foreign Ministry will keep their situation in view and will defend their rights.

In our project for the future organization of the world we assign a capital role to the United Nations and international institutions. Here too we have made a breakthrough in thinking.

The priority of common human values also implies the priority of world institutions. In today's world many ideological goals are outweighed by threats to our civilization. We must realize that there are no longer any problems in the world that are not our concern. The state of the world economy is a question of our prosperity. The threat of ecological catastrophe is a problem of our survival. The fight against disease and epidemics in other countries is a fight for Soviet people's health.

I am speaking of these seemingly obvious things in order to emphasize the idea that in the "single human community" you must not only take but also share what you have.

I am speaking of this in connection with the United Nations, because participation in its activity requires expenditure and you hear questions: Do we really need to participate extensively in the United Nations, what does it really offer?

We enjoy a return that more than covers the expenditure. It is a political and material return.

Via the United Nations it is possible to reduce the costs that we would have to bear because of regional conflicts and tension and the threat of a regional flareup escalating into a major war.

Without the United Nations it would have been difficult to expect the conclusion of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, which made it possible to bring our soldiers home in a dignified fashion, without losses, and without loss of face.

The Security Council's efforts helped to end military operations near our borders—between Iran and Iraq.

Under UN auspices bacteriological weapons have been outlawed and questions such as the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the ending of nuclear tests, and essentially the whole complex of disarmament problems are being resolved.

The solution of ecological problems via the United Nations promises substantial savings of money and time and will give us access to a huge mass of ecological information.

Global economic problems can be alleviated with the help of the financial and credit institutions of the UN system.

Special importance attaches today to compatibility between the measures to reform the economic mechanism being carried out in the USSR and international practice. Here too we need the help of international organizations.

We need parliament's help and support in correctly constructing and affirming one of the main dimensions of security—the human dimension.

It is shameful to admit it, but just recently we used to say "so-called human rights" and to claim that we had no problems in this regard.

We have made a real psychological, political, and legal breakthrough in raising and resolving humanitarian questions and have attained world standards. We would ask the Supreme Soviet to find the time in its extremely busy schedule to examine the draft laws on entry into and exit from the country, freedom of conscience, and social organizations.

The criterion of foreign policy's effectiveness and tenability is the match between its aims and principles and public ideals and values, people's aspirations and hopes.

That is why it is so important for foreign policy to be based on a nationwide consensus.

The new Soviet parliament is an institution for forming a nationwide consensus. However, it would be wrong to believe that this will be an automatic consequence of glasnost and democratic debate.

Because it is locked into world-outlook values, foreign policy always affects the interests of individual groups of the population.

We have long made out that all our actions on disarmament enjoy unanimous backing. But even at the Congress of People's Deputies critical voices have been raised.

We know that people do question why we are eliminating more armaments than the United States.

Here we have rethought the situation: Security does not mean having more weapons ourselves, but having fewer weapons against us.

The arms race has its own logic. It consists in a desire to achieve real or imagininary superiority.

This logic is countered by the Soviet concept of sufficiency for defense needs and ensuring equivalent security by eliminating asymmetries and imbalances and establishing lower levels for all kinds of armaments. This concept is recognized and is already working, providing an essential boost to the disarmament processes.

Our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions is recalled by some. It did not develop into a general moratorium. And the conclusion drawn from this is that it produced no result. I personally disagree with this: We did obtain a political result, and a quite considerable one. But I do have the feeling at the same time that we did not do all that we could have done with the moratorium, did not exploit all the opportunities. Nowadays the public, for example the Semipalatinsk-Nevada movement, can play an important role. Objectively the situation is that it is necessary to persuade first and foremost the American administration. A complete halt to tests is only possible on a bilateral basis.

Those who criticize us for our inclination toward unilateral steps should bear in mind that there have, after all, been unilateral actions of another kind. In 1969 the Americans stopped producing chemical weapons. Our response was to continue pursuing the "bulk production of chemical weapons" for almost two decades, heedless of the billions spent, the damage to the environment, and the danger to people's health.

Enlightenment has dawned. We have begun to resolutely seek a ban on chemical weapons and a halt to their production. Thanks to our efforts and the efforts of our partners enormous progress has been made in drafting an international convention. A convention on this score is a realistic and close prospect.

True, we are alarmed by statements by some figures in the American administration which can be seen as showing a desire to continue the production of binary chemical munitions and maintain some kind of "insurance reserve" of chemical arms in the future. Given such a stance, it is not only the convention that is called into question. A new twist could be given to the chemical arms race spiral.

In a number of instances our unilateral steps serve as a kind of down payment on future accords.

By our decision to reduce our armed forces by 500,000 men and make a concomitant reduction of armaments and combat hardware we gave a confident start to promising talks on deep cuts in troops and conventional weapons in Europe. This will make it possible to attain not only considerably lower and equal levels of armed forces but also to make vast savings in money and resources.

Today we talk about the conclusion of an agreement on European armaments in 1990 as a real possibility and have proposed convening an all-European summit meeting to complete this work.

The full story of the preparation and conclusion of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will be written one day. The arithmetic of it alone—four summit meetings, around 30 meetings of foreign ministers, months of negotiations, a multitude of consultations among military and civilian experts—reflects the intense search for solutions.

I remember that at the time there were quite a few people who accused the diplomats of making concessions and giving ground and not taking defense interests into account.

But the treaty exists. It is part of our lives. And the critics have disappeared somewhere. While Soviet people have begun to feel at ease and confident—there are no longer nuclear missiles on the other side capable of hitting a target in the European part of our country within 7 minutes with an accuracy down to meters.

And the treaty is already saving us R400 million a year, and this will increase after the elimination is completed.

Such is the price of "concessions." Without concessions, there is no compromise, and without compromises there will be no agreement and no diplomacy at all.

Retrospectively, you see the enormous significance that the principle of on-site inspection adopted at the Stockholm Conference has had for peace.

Acting in like spirit, we have supported President Bush's idea of establishing an open-skies regime and will be taking part in an international conference in Canada to discuss this proposal.

But if we "open" the skies, why not also open the land, the sea, the oceans, and outer space to glasnost? We have advocated global confidence measures embracing all the natural spheres. And here the question of whether naval arms should fall within the scope of cuts and confidence-building measures arises with all its acuteness. The desire of the United States and its NATO allies to keep naval forces out of the disarmament talks forces us to suppose that the other side has not abandoned the idea of achieving superiority through these arms.

In such an event many of the positive things we have managed to achieve through joint efforts in recent years would be undermined.

If there are achievements in foreign policy, and there undoubtedly are, this is thanks not least to the existence of a well-oiled mechanism for coordinating positions in which representatives of the party Central Committee, the government, the Defense Ministry, the KGB, and the defense industry and scientists and diplomats work in close and creative collaboration.

The success is the consequence of joint work directed by the political leadership. But the main motive force behind our foreign policy is the restructuring, renewal, and democratization of Soviet society.

However, the authority of restructuring does not of itself render us immune to mistakes. And it is important to acknowledge and rectify them, not conceal them.

The story of the Krasnoyarsk radar tracking station is instructive here.

We investigated the station for 4 years. The charge against us was that it violated the ABM Treaty. The whole truth did not become known to the country's leadership right away.

Eventually we were convinced: The station had not been constructed in a place where this could have been done.

Throughout these years we have waged and we continue to wage a struggle to preserve the ABM Treaty as the foundation for strategic stability. We seek arguments and conduct highly complex debate on interpretation of the treaty articles and appendices.

And all the time this station on the scale of the Egyptian pyramids has stood, demonstrating, let us be frank, a breach of the ABM Treaty.

Finally we put an end to the problem. We stated that we were dismantling the station. Again objections were raised—our interests were being abandoned, people said.

The fact is that we are saving the ABM treaty and opening the way to concluding strategic arms agreements and obtaining the legal and moral right to demand clarity on the question of the American stations in Greenland and Britain which are being modernized, as we understand it, in breach of the treaty. And we can look our partners honestly in the eye and count on having our honesty repaid in kind.

We are counting on our specialists' being afforded the opportunity to visit these American stations and seeing for themselves that the work there is not in breach of the ABM Treaty.

And yet one should ask what guided those who took the decision to construct the Krasnoyarsk station, which cost several hundred million rubles. The dismantling will also require money, transport, and manpower. Again policy turns out to have its economic aspect and financial consequences. We again see for ourselves that ill-considered decisions cost us dearly.

The country's Supreme Soviet is discussing the budget and draft plan. People's deputies are aware of the extent of the needs and the paucity of money and resources.

But today we can reshape the budget and the plan in the direction of the social sphere and invest resources where we can expect to obtain a return in order to improve Soviet people's well-being.

Would that be at all possible, if the political environment had remained as it was, say, before the times of perestroyka? If the war was still going on in Afghanistan, if the status quo had persisted in relations with China, if plans for nuclear and other arms upgrading in Europe had been implemented, if there were no real prospect of strategic and conventional arms reduction?

Would our children have come back from army service to continue their studies? Yet 170,000 of them have come back! And where would our engineers have gone: into the management schools, or onto civil defense courses?

But we would be making an unforgivable mistake if we failed to see another reality behind these positive changes.

We are living in a superarmed world under the continuing threat of nuclear catastrophe. Our country is encircled by a network of military bases. We hear calls from certain Western politicians and generals for the continuation of the buildup of arms arsenals and the creation of new means of destruction. They still use the Soviet military threat to intimidate the world. Some people are nostalgic for the "cold war" and uphold the ideology of great-power domination and hegemonism.

There are a good many supporters of the arms race in the world. They have their power base, primarily in the form of the military-industrial complex. This too must be reckoned with.

We must be strong. We must have Armed Forces sufficient to defend the country. We must have modern arms.

Our Armed Forces need concern and attention in a new dimension. Because today the country's defense capability lies in the conformity of military theory with the state of scientific and technical progress and the latest achievements of human thought. It lies in the quality of our technology and our skill in using it, in the human conditions of the life of the Soviet officer and his family, in our soldiers' diets, in our concern for veterans.

And surely no one can doubt that it lies most of all in a renewed, democratic, rule-of-law society, in a free people, in the free man.

I think this interpretation of our tasks will find support among the people's deputies.

Measured on any scale, the Soviet Union now holds a worthy place in the ranks of the nations.

There is no state in the world that does not want to develop relations with us, extend ties and contacts, and exchange people, ideas, and information.

We maintain correct, normal relations with all countries. Let me remind you of a formula from the report at the 19th party conference. We do not have strained relations—still less hostile relations—with any state. We have not seen a deterioration in our relations with any state, and with many they have improved. This formula is constantly being given material form and enriched.

For the first time in many years not one Soviet soldier is participating—nor, I am certain, will he participate—in military operations anywhere in the world. We have put forward the idea of eliminating foreign military bases and military presence on other people's territories by the year 2000.

For the first time the number of Soviet servicemen outside our national borders is falling sharply. We are prepared, on a reciprocal basis, to work toward the disbandment of military-political groupings in Europe.

The Soviet Union is participating actively in the settling of regional situations in southern Africa, Central America, Cyprus, and the Korean Peninsula, around Cambodia, and in the Near East, the Horn of Africa, and the Western Sahara, maintaining contacts with all interested parties.

The Soviet Union is an active partner of the Nonaligned Movement and many regional organizations and associations, and maintains business contacts with them.

A favorable atmosphere is emerging for the development of mutually beneficial economic, commercial, scientific, and technical ties and the exchange of modern technologies. We are restricted not only by external factors, but by internal circumstances and an inefficient foreign economic mechanism. I must admit that the Foreign Ministry too is lagging seriously behind in perestroyka specifically in the field of foreign economic relations.

The Soviet land today feels immeasurably more at ease in the international arena than ever before.

Our foreign policy has an extensive agenda.

Next in line are the major foreign policy actions connected with M.S. Gorbachev's visits to Finland and Italy. We expect them not only to invest our relations with those countries with a new quality, but also to give a new boost to the development of the Helsinki process, the further development of the project for an all-European home, and progress at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces reduction and on confidence-building measures.

Ahead lies a new Soviet-American summit meeting, which will undoubtedly be an event in world politics. This is not merely an important milestone in our dealings with the new U.S. Administration, but the next "intermediate finishing post" in the constructively developing political dialogue between the two great nuclear powers. We hope that at the meeting between our countries' leaders the line of moving on from mutual understanding to collaboration will be reinforced and will be given material form. First and foremost in the nuclear disarmament sphere. An agreement on strategic offensive arms is of fundamental significance in this sense. It will make it possible to bring the other nuclear powers into the talks and open the way to a nuclear-free world.

And every day there is the work of implementing the basic avenues of foreign policy approved by the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the basis of the program set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's report to the Congress and in the government platform presented by N.I. Ryzhkov.

Reflecting the new state of our society, the activity of the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet marks a very important step along the path of creating a rule-of-law state. Its formation will give new strength to our international positions, enhance the Soviet Union's prestige in the eyes of the rest of the world, and give powerful support to the country's diplomatic service.

Our ministry has already established business ties with the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and other committees and commissions. To this end a specialized subunit has been set up at the Foreign Ministry, staffed by experienced, well-known diplomats, and a working plan has been drawn up.

The International Affairs Committee has already held a number of useful and important hearings on topical questions of the Soviet Union's international activity. The discussion in the committee of the problem of banning nuclear tests, our fulfillment of the Vienna accords in the humanitarian sphere, certain aspects of foreign economic relations, and other questions, with the participation of deputy foreign ministers and representatives of other departments, is up to the high standards of glasnost and openness and enables the parliamentarians directly to feel the pulse of our diplomacy. This practice ensures an effective, all-around link between the foreign policy department and the highest organ of state power.

In the course of the debates in the Supreme Soviet many deputies gave a positive assessment of the country's foreign policy and the course and content of perestroyka in the diplomatic service. We saw this as a manifestation of the consensus of the whole people with regard to the state's international activity. For us, however, this does not mean that our diplomacy is problem-free. I have listed by no means all its tricky areas, many of which have an acute effect on the country's internal well-being.

We will do everything possible to rectify the situation and promote perestroyka to the maximum extent.

Another important area of the USSR Foreign Ministry's activity will be work connected with safeguarding the rights and interests of the union republics.

At the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies the question of putting into practice the constitutional pricniple of the sovereignty of union republics was raised. Of course, the fundamental problems relating to this can be resolved in the new Constitution and in legislative acts. That will take a good deal of time.

Now we are thinking about how to involve the union republic foreign ministries in the union's foreign policy measures, primarily those in which particular republics have a special interest. For example, in the sphere of the country's regional policy and its relations with adjacent countries, in talks on the line of the borders, and in solving questions of economic cooperation.

The USSR Foreign Ministry proposes expanding the republics' participation in preparing and holding visits to appropriate countries, in talks directly affecting their interests, and in international organizations of the UN system.

We also propose establishing under the Union Foreign Ministry a consultative council of the union republic foreign ministers.

Obviously, it is necessary to increase republics' representation in union diplomatic and consular establishments in countries where the republics have valid specific interests. Their representatives could also be invested with the necessary powers to protect these interests.

Comrades are raising the question of union republics' membership of the United Nations. When this organization was being set up the Soviet Union sought such a solution.

Unfortunately, today even to raise the question of UN membership presupposes a review of the organization's charter, for today even parts of confederate states, let alone of a federation, cannot be UN members. An exception was made for Belorussia and the Ukraine in special historical conditions as founders of the organization.

But we will seek to extend union republics' participation in the activity of international organizations, including the system of specialized UN establishments.

I would note in this connection that republican foreign ministers are also in rotation members of the USSR delegation at the UN General Assembly sessions.

We shall improve assistance to the republics in training diplomatic cadres, we shall organize more regular on-the-job training for them in USSR Foreign Ministry components and foreign missions.

The union republics can and must make a weighty contribution to the development of political, economic, and cultural ties with many countries and peoples. On the whole we see no obstacles now to the union republics being independently represented abroad by commercial bureaus, participating in ecological projects, and conducting exchanges in the cultural, scientific, and information spheres. All these questions are being studied in a department for ties with the union republics specially set up in the ministry.

These measures constitute one way to strengthen the federation and give real substance to national sovereignty and at the same time constitute an effective means of building civilized interstate relations. It is impossible to seriously establish them without the most active contact between union republics, autonomous formations, krays, oblasts, cities, and collectives and the rest of the world.

Living at the same rhythm as the country, we carefully listening to the world's pulse. We know that for it the word "perestroyka" contains a living symbol of faith. Having long ago ceased to be our internal affair, it has truly become the affair of all mankind. And peoples are by no means indifferent to how the renewal process will develop. For them our internal stability is the world's stability.

This is the guarantee of its survival and mankind's salvation.

That is no exaggeration. It really is so. Awareness of this must be combined with understanding of the great responsibility for the work which our party began, guided by the people's interests.

Today these interests have a worldwide dimension, and form a direct part of interests common to all mankind and of our civilization's fate.

This reality must be the uniting principle for us all, regardless of our views, convictions, or beliefs, and serve as an additional stimulus to overcome our national and other differences, and to unite and consolidate all forces in the interests of the common good of all peoples and nations.

Things are not easy for us all now. But awareness of the mission which has fallen to our lot helps us to bear the heavy burden of today's concerns and to believe that the goal is attainable.

We shall move toward it without diverging from the path.

I am grateful to the Supreme Soviet for the chance to speak.

Thank you for your attention.

Lukyanov Chairs 24 Oct Constitution Debate

LD2410121589 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 24 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament reconvened today for a joint sitting of the two houses under the chairmanship of First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov.

Amendments to the Soviet Constitution concerning the electoral system are expected to be adopted today. They will pave the way for democratic elections to republican and local government bodies.

The discussion of draft amendments and addenda to the Soviet Constitution started on Monday morning. The parliament decided to interrupt the joint sitting for additional elaboration of the document in committees and commissions.

It was decided to expedite the adoption of amendments, considering that republican electoral laws, many provisions of which depend on amendments to the country's fundamental law, are expected to be adopted in a number of republics this week.

At the end of the day it is also planned to discuss the candidacy of Stepan Sitaryan, suggested by the USSR Council of Ministers, for the post of deputy prime minister and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers' State Foreign Economic Commission.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Meets With Members of PRAVDA

Expresses Gratitude

PM2410110089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "M.S. Gorbachev at the PRAVDA Editorial Office"]

[Text] A meeting took place at the PRAVDA editorial office yesterday between M.S. Gorbachev and members of the editorial collegium, section editors, and members of the party committee.

M.S. Gorbachev introduced PRAVDA's new chief editor, I.T. Frolov. He expressed gratitude to V.G. Afanasyev, who headed the newspaper's collectives for more than 13 years, for his services in developing the party press. PRAVDA's great contribution to perestroyka and to the shaping of public opinion in the spirit of innovative ideas and the revolutionary renewal of society was noted.

During a frank, comradely talk with the PRAVDA workers, topical problems of the development of the party and society, the enhancement of the role of the party press at the present stage of perestroyka, and the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress were touched on. The need was stressed to reinforce the constructive nature of the press' contributions and the responsibility of the mass media for the truthfulness and accuracy of the printed word.

M.S. Gorbachev spoke at the meeting. V.A. Medvedev took part in the talks. A report of the meeting at the editorial office will be published in PRAVDA.

Introduces Chief Editor Frolov

LD2310195189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting took place today between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the editorial collegium, the departmental editors, political observers, and journalists of PRAVDA.

Mikhail Sergeyevich wished success to Viktor Grigoriyevich Afanasyev, who has given much effort to the newspaper and who has now transferred to academic work. He introduced to those present the new chief editor, Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov. He was confirmed recently by the party Central Committee.

Many acute and topical problems in the life of our society were noted during the conversation with the journalists. In particular Mikhail Sergeyevich had this to say:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] We have a very great interest in PRAVDA and in increasing its work, comrades. There will be discussion of this somewhat later. I'll tell you in a party way, frankly, and directly, that this is necessary; it is necessary for the party, for the people, it is necessary for our enormous cause, the revolutionary cause of perestroyka. You know when someone there simply intimidates us by saying that we have moved too quickly along the road of perestroyka, then that is one thing; or when someone criticizes us for going too slowly and says we have to speed up, almost to a gallop, one could put up with all of that and react more calmly.

But now an appropriate assessment has to be given to those positions. Why? Because both from right and from left, from both these extreme right-wing and extreme left-wing positions, from extreme positions, I would say, there are attempts to infiltrate their opinions into society, to introduce confusion into society, to muddle people's thinking, to sow a lack of faith in our present-day affairs. I believe that today this is one of the most important tasks of the party and the party press: to bring home to our people the meaning of what is taking place in society, so that no one might yield to the temptation of responding to these very dangerous slogans. I have already had occasion to speak about this, and I will repeat this constantly, because there is danger here, comrades.

The PRAVDA people must bear this in mind and conduct an open dialogue with the working people. We need our people to know that we are devoted to perestroyka, that perestroyka is in the interests of people, and that the most active efforts are being made today in the party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and government to remove the acute socioeconomic problems in society. [end recording]

The meeting at the PRAVDA editorial offices is continuing. Comrade Medvedev is taking part in it.

New Chief Editor Profiled

PM2310160089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Unattributed profile of new PRAVDA chief editor I. Frolov, plus interview with him by IZVESTIYA correspondent K. Smirnov, under the rubric "Names and Events": "PRAVDA's Chief Editor"—date, place of interview not stated]

[Text] Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov was born in 1929 in the village of Dobroye, Dobrovskiy Rayon, Lipetsk Oblast. He graduated from the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University in 1953. He began his career in journalism as a junior editor at a publishing house. He was senior secretary on the journals VOPROSY FILOSOFII and PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, and chief editor of the journal VOPROSY FILOSOFII. Then he was in academic work. From 1986 he was chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST. In 1987-1989 he was an assistant to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary. In 1976 he was elected corresponding member, and in 1987 full member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

It should be added to this outline that Frolov is the author of more than 20 books and 300 articles on problems of the comprehensive study of man, ecology, and the social and ethical problems of scientific and technical progress (among them "On Man and Humanism," "Prospects for Man," "The Ethics of Science," "Global Problems of Civilization," and "Philosophy and the History of Genetics: Quest and Debate").

The new chief editor of PRAVDA is a member of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR People's deputy, chairman of the All-Union Center for Human Sciences, cochairman of the world movement "Ecoforum for Peace," and member of the directorate of the International Institute of Life.

During the years when Frolov was chief editor of VOPROSY FILOSOFII, on his initiative the journal launched a struggle against scholasticism and dogmatism and for the establishment of truly scientific principles in our philosophy and human values and the study of global problems common to all mankind—ecological, demographic, and other problems. This activity of his constantly came under criticism from the Brezhnevist-Suslovist ideologists.

When several expert commissions were set up to justify the diversion of northern and Siberian waters to the south and all the commissions obediently said "yes," only two of them came out with a firm "no"—the commission on cultural monuments, headed by Academician D. Likhachev, and the ecological commission, headed by I. Frolov.

IZVESTIYA correspondent K. Smirnov met with Ivan Timofeyevich after his new appointment.

[Smirnov] You are becoming PRAVDA's chief editor at a difficult time. Perestroyka is in progress. The 28th CPSU Congress lies ahead. How do you see the creed of the party's central organs in these conditions?

[Frolov] I have ideas on this, of course. Otherwise I would not have agreed to take the post. But I think it is still too early for me to answer that question with close reference to newspaper columns, rubrics, and orientations.

In general terms it is clear to all of us that the Central Committee and its organ, PRAVDA, share the same creed: revolutionary transformations, which must spread not only horizontally, but also vertically in all spheres of our life. Democratization, glasnost, economic and political reform. The building of a rule-of-law state, whose outlines have begun to emerge, clearly though with difficulty, in the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Spiritual, cultural, and moral renewal. Finally, the new thinking, including the dialectics of common human interests and class interests, the new humanism.

All these are the conceptual principles of the Communist Party, and the CPSU's real prestige, not its prestige as measured by slogans, depends on how these principles are put into practice. This prestige can only be increased by actively restructuring the party itself. In these times, no one is given prestige on credit.

PRAVDA should be not merely a mass newspaper, but a newspaper of the whole people, expressing people's thoughts, hearts, concerns. Man and the humanistic values of socialism should be at the center of all its material. Truth [pravda] and glasnost are closely related in meaning. To unite the newspaper's name with the content of each issue—that is the main task. The party's central organ, founded by Lenin, can have no other creed.

This is particularly important for us next year, when the newspaper's work will be illuminated by the preparations for the party congress, which I am confident the CPSU will approach as a strong, renewed party capable of continuing to head the revolutionary perestroyka it began.

Kazakh Deputy Discusses Nuclear-Free Zone

LD2310182189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Interview with Olzhas Suleymenov, USSR people's deputy from Kazakhstan, by correspondent Lyudmila Semina "after the session" of the Supreme Soviet on 23 October in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] [Semina] I have often heard here at the session your passionate speeches in defense of your republic, speeches against nuclear tests in Semipalatinsk.

[Suleymenov] I think that when we speak against the nuclear madness, we are defending here not only the population of one republic, but also of the whole Union, and most certainly—without any doubt even—all mankind. Only this moves us in this direction. When we have just heard the report by Comrade Shevardnadze—words to the effect that our country is in favor of nuclear-free zones in the Pacific, Latin America, Central and Northern Europe, the Balkans—then one involuntarily wonders that it would after all be logical to declare our own country a nuclear-free zone. It is necessary to move toward this.

I believe that the continuation of the moratorium which existed in 1987, the continuation of this moratorium in the new conditions, when society and people's democracy have become more active, could produce significantly more valuable and lasting results and could meet with a response in other countries too, in particular in the United States, especially the United States. So this is what we are saying.

I was recently at a meeting in Karaganda, and I heard the pain with which the miners, metalurgists, workers who gave speeches spoke. They spoke of an improvement in production matters, and at the same time they raised the question of the nuclear test site, that is, they are leaving their everyday, workshop problems and have attained a kind of general human concern. That is right, because this is what now unites the whole multinational population of Kazakhstan at this time.

Enough is enough. For 40 years now they have been exploding bombs regardless of the health of the population, so to speak. The state has shown complete disrespect toward its citizens. Unfortunately, we have to speak perfectly responsibly. But now when we are already aware of our problems, we have to act more circumspectly. I have in mind the state. I have in mind the departments and the former ministry of medium machine building and now the ministry of atomic power.

[Semina] Tell me please, I know that you have spoken on several occasions with such a deputy's request, both at the meeting of the international committee and here at the joint session of the chambers. Do you detect support from the parliament?

[Suleymenov] Yes, I detect support, when on my request, a document was adopted, and I stress, the first document of our new parliament, a document on parliamentary diplomacy, as it were, an appeal to the U.S. Congress proposing a mutual moratorium. There wasn't a single person who would have voted against it. The appeal was 100 percent. It is rare that such documents have come our way now, you know. But here there was a completely unanimous response. I would here like to call on our scientists too, nuclear power workers, physicists, such as (Galdanskiy), deputies like Trefilov and Sagdeyev, Velikhov—I am not speaking of Sakharov, I know his viewpoint—to speak with the people, explain the need, the expedience in this continuation of the test cycle, maybe to stop in good time.

[Semina] Olzhas Omarovich, for the first time at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet a report was heard from Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. On our foreign policy. What is your attitude toward this?

[Sulaymenov] I believe that at present we are having more success on the international front than on the domestic one, that is, our relations with other countries, at least with the countries of the West, have significantly improved. There is already greater mutual understanding, a recognition of the interdependence of our countries is becoming an effective factor. Here in our country, within the country, and especially in the republic we have not reached, have not risen to this level, an understanding of our interdependence of each other. The main thing is that the world sees us now already as a society which is increasingly opening up, that we are entering this system of integration, interaction, interdependence, and we understand that we are not some kind of autonomous organ in the integral organism of humanity.

Kirgizia Steps up Antidrug Activity

LD2310101489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0855 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Frunze, 23 Oct [No press agency attribution as received]—TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev reports:

Some 160 kg of marijuana has been seized during a 7-day operation to combat the drug business which has been carried out in Soviet Kirgizia. Journalists were informed of this today at the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Special units dedicated to combatting organized crime participated in the operation, along with Army helicopters, said Militia Lieutenant Colonel Viktor Loganikhin. The Chuyskaya Valley—Kirgizia's main drug supplier—was blockaded on all sides. The operation was timed to coincide with the mass export of drugs from the valley. More than 5,000 motor vehicles alone were checked.

According to official figures, Kirgizia, with its population of 4 million, has just over 1,000 drug addicts. The bulk of the narcotic substances grown and processed in the republic are exported to other areas of the USSR. A separate subdivision now has been set up in the Kirgiz Ministry of Internal Affairs to deal with the drug business. It has been given considerable funding. Kennels have been set up where dogs will be specially trained to discover drugs. This will make the actions of the law and order bodies more effective in this field.

Tajik Party Censures Vernacular Press

90US0128A Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 6 Oct 89 p 1

[Unattributed article: "In the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan"; Tajik Press Agency]

[Text] Discussion took place in the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee with regard to the work of the editorial board and editorial collective of the newspaper TODZHIKISTONI SOVETI in reporting on problems of social and economic development in the republic in light of the requirements of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference and the 1st Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. It is noted in the adopted resolution that the editorial board and collective are striving to provide purposeful coverage of key issues concerning socio-economic development in the republic, the course of economic reform, and the democratization of social life. The newspaper regularly publishes pertinent material on the introduction of economic accountability, leasing and cooperative societies, individual-labor activity, and other forms of labor organization. Its published subject matter and analytical approach have expanded and accumulated depth. The publication from Shugnanskiy Rayon was discussed in the secretariat of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee in November 1988.

A number of "roundtable" discussions on the problems associated with improving working conditions and life in the village were conducted jointly with experts from branches of the republic's economy. Heads of enterprises and organizations were severely criticized for their slow resolution of problems concerning the ecology and health issues, for their bureaucratism. Along with the party bureau, the editorial board is striving to educate journalists in today's political culture, to enhance party and civic responsibility for the job they been entrusted to perform.

At the same time, the editorial board and editorial collective are not taking full advantage of the great creative potential at their disposal, especially in reporting on the activity of party committees and primary party organizations, soviets, and the introduction of a new management mechanism.

An inadequate degree of exactingness regarding the quality of published material has been diminishing the newspaper's overall level. Journalists have not eliminated stock phrases and standard stylistic approaches, one-sidedness and superficiality in reporting on the complex processes of perestroyka.

The newspaper seldom publishes criticism towards specific leaders of party and soviet organs, ministries and departments, for errors in their work with cadre, for their administrative-command style of management. Some published materials show a lack of constructiveness. The newspaper does not always cover the purposeful work being done in monitoring fulfillment of the decisions of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee. Thus, following adoption by the 11th Central Committee Plenum of the "Housing-93" program, the newspaper published only 15 articles dealing with the course of its implementation. Little has been published in the light of the March (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

The resolution points out the insignificant role played by the editorial board in leading the creative process, the lack of a work plan and other deficiencies, including improving its relationship with its readers.

At the same time, the party organization has exerted little influence in enhancing the vitality of this organ, and in selecting and placing its cadre who do not promote glasnost or the democratic approach.

It was recommended to newspaper editor and CPSU member M.M. Mabatshoyev and to party bureau secretary G.M. Murodaliyev that they effect positive improvements in their work, that they direct the exclusive creative effort of journalists towards seeking a high activity level in newspaper editions, diversity in genre, and stylistic improvements. An atmosphere of high exactingness and creative interaction must be created in the collective. Employees must be held strictly accountable for their errors, distortion, primitivism, and narrowness in analyzing the processes of perestroyka.

The editorial board and party organization of the newspaper, the resolution continues, must concentrate journalists' efforts on covering the major issues of perestroyka. They must consider one of the chief tasks of the newspaper to be that of doing its utmost to facilitate the consolidation of society; to strive, under pluralistic-view conditions, to attain unity of action in accomplishing the program of perestroyka.

The editorial collective should establish close contact with labor collectives, scientific institutions, ministries and departments, party and soviet organs, with the aim of providing more precise and thorough coverage of the problems and difficulties which must be overcome at the local level during the course of perestroyka.

Published materials must reflect the transition to new forms of management, economic accountability, and self-management. They must use the particulars of local life to uncover the deep essence of restructuring economic relationships on the basis of diversity of ownership. They must decisively expose excessive dependence, egalitarianism, and the group egoism of labor collectives, while at the same time improving feedback from their readership and the manner in which they handle letters of the working class. They must make these an effective means of monitoring the state of affairs in local areas, of waging a decisive struggle against bureaucratism, poor management, and lack of discipline. They must more fully afford workers the opportunity to publish expressions of their opinion, proposals, critical observations. They must establish journalist reporting stations at the most important sites and facilities of the republic.

They must obligate party members—journalists and heads of editorial collectives—to provide broad, all-encompassing coverage of the everyday activity of the primary party organizations, show the full complexity and dialectical nature of their political functioning under conditions of perestroyka, find up-to-date methods of exerting party influence in the socio- economic sphere, analyze the actual relationships among party organizations, the soviets of people's deputies, and social organizations.

The ideology section of the Central Committee is directed to draw up procedures for structuring the probationary period of journalists in party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol [All- Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organs, with the aim of studying more fully the content of their work and achieving more effective subsequent reporting.

Party committees and organizations, and communists from among the chiefs of soviet, trade union, Komsomol, and economic organs, enterprises and social organizations, must provide journalists access to information that concerns them, with the exception of state secrets. They must respond in principled fashion to critical press coverage and get apparatus employees more intensely involved in publications work.

The resolution states it would be advisable to observe annual TODZHIKISTONI SOVETI newspaper festivals and meetings with readers in the cities and rayons of the republic.

The Central Committee department for administration of affairs and its publishing house must exercise more attention to detail in accomplishing the tasks of material-technical provision of the editorial staff, in providing the apportionment of additional means for work with the people.

Azerbaijan Party Meeting on NKAO Reported

NC2410090289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 24 Oct 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Newspapers report on the mass meeting held at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee by the republic's party aktiv and representatives of social and creative (?organizations). The meeting examined the results of the work carried out by the deputies committee on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and the 20 October meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at the meeting.

Speakers at the meeting noted that the realization of the proposals put forward by the USSR Supreme Soviet will contribute to to strengthening interethnic relations, establishing economic stability in NKAO, and normalizing the general situation.

The main task (?at the present time) is to improve the multifaceted and friendly traditions between the Armenians and Azerbaijanis in the NKAO and find ways and means to remove disagreements. [Words indistinct] mutual steps must be taken by the sides toward each other for the sake of present and future generations. This is required by the course of restructuring and by the effort under way to normalize the situation in the region.

Political Settlement Discussed

LD2310234289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; TASS attributed report]

[Text] A meeting of the Azerbaijan party aktiv, representatives of the public and the creative intelligentsia, took place in Baku today. The results of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium which took place on 20 October and which considered information on the results of the work of the deputies' commission on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], were discussed. An important result of the discussions were proposals worked out at the session on a political settlement to the problem. Comrade Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at the aktiv.

Bayramov Discusses Azerbaijan's Sovereignty

NC2410100189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Report by Ershad Akhmedov: "The Republic's Sovereignty"]

[Text] The constitutional law on the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] was adopted on 25 September. (?Lengthy) articles published in the press in connection with the new law all point to [words indistinct]. M. Bayramov, chairman of the People's Court, said the following:

Certain developments mark a turning point in the history of a people and country. The adoption and implementation of the constitutional law on the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR is one of these developments. Each article of this law not only clearly proclaims the Azerbaijan SSR as a sovereign republic but also creates an authentic basis to establish and maintain this sovereignty.

In essence the law affirms that the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR sovereignty extends throughout the entire republic. Article 5 of the new law clearly notes: The Azerbaijan SSR's sovereignty extends throughout the whole of the republic, including the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], which are inseparable parts of Azerbaijan SSR.

The law means that there can be no alteration of the republic's boundries, no matter who calls for such an alteration. Article 5 states that Azerbaijan SSR's territory is indivisible and this has been upheld through a referendum. No change can be effected without an agreement.

The republic's sovereignty means that the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet is responsible for the Azerbaijan

SSR's state sovereignty and that the republic enjoys freedom in its relations within the federation and in its international relations.

As the law points out, sovereignty, which is an inseparable part of state suzerainty, cannot be (?replaced or removed). Nor can it be [words indistinct].

Undoubtedly, the Soviet Union and the allied republics enjoy sovereignty rights within the Soviet state. Furthermore, there is no conflict between the sovereignty of Azerbaijan and that of any other republic. In fact, they are bound together in harmony established by the constitution. This means that there can be no conflict between the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR and that of the NKAO and all citizens who live in the NKAO must be subject to and comply with the laws of the Azerbaijan SSR.

As we have already mentioned, our republic is an independent and sovereign state. Within this context, the NKAO and Nakhichevan ASSR are inseparable parts of Azerbaijan SSR. In view of this, the hoisting of the flag of another republic in NKAO and the nonenforcement of the Azerbaijan SSR's laws in that oblast are unlawful activities.

It is no coincidence that Article 5 of the new law points out that the republic's [word indistinct], flag, [word indistinct], and currency, which represent the Azerbaijan SSR's state sovereignty, are sacred and any contempt against them is punishable by law. Therefore, any sabotage or other unlawful activities in NKAO must be (?investigated) and punished in accordance with the laws.

'Worsening' Economic Condition in NKAO Noted

NC2410112389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 24 Oct 89

[Text] Assistance to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] continues.

The oblast's economic situation is worsening every day. Production units and construction organizations are unable to resume a normal work rhythm. This is only to be expected since they are receiving the necessary material (?on a delayed basis).

Construction workers have not been working since mid-September and workers in the [word indistinct], shoe, sewing, and (?electrical) plants are facing a criticial situation. The acute fuel shortage is creating severe problems in transportation.

In view of the continuing blockade, the workers of Armenia are extending a helping hand to those of Artsakh [NKAO]. The Masis production-commercial union collective helped the shoe plant receive gasoline for the preparation of [word indistinct], which enabled the plant to resume operation after 1 week of idleness. The Armenian electrical-mechanical production union also participated in this noble act by sending necessary material to the Stepanakert condenser manufacturing plant. The Karabakh electron workers, in turn, have sent 800 kg of beef. The difficulties stemming from the blockade call for such reciprocal acts. Recently the plant received more than 3 tonnes of potatoes from colleagues in Kamo.

Last Sunday, 12 railcars of flour, 5 railcars of sugar, 2 railcars of mineral water, 1 railcar of soap powder, and 4 tanks of gasoline arrived at the railway station in the oblast's capital. However, all this is a mere drop in the bucket. The city is suffering from acute shortages, especially of wheat, vegetables, canned food, and cigarettes.

The most important objective of the NKAO special administration committee is to defend the efficient operation of the oblast's vital organizations.

Update on Arrival of Trains in Armenia

NC2410110389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 24 Oct 89

[Text] Between 1800 on 21 October and 1800 on 22 October Moscow time, trains continued to arrive in Armenia over Azerbaijan railways. Seventeen trains with a total of 916 railcars traveled through Norashen, while 5 trains with a total of 255 railcars traveled through Idzhevan. Cargo aboard the trains consisted of 198 tanks of oil including 63 tanks of gasoline, as well as 93 railcars of prefabricated houses, 136 railcars of construction material, 67 railcars of cement, and 37 railcars of manufactured goods. In addition, there were 6 railcars of sugar, (?4) railcars of eggs, wheat products, and vegetables, 18 railcars of potatoes, and 14 railcars of wheat.

Fifteen trains with a total of 414 railcars arrived from Georgia on the same day carrying 15 tanks of oil products including 14 tanks of gasoline, 72 railcars of prefabricated houses, 162 railcars of construction material, 12 railcars of cement, as well as manufactured goods and 1 railcar of cocoa.

The Yerevan branch of the Transcaucasus Railway reported that 25 trains carrying essential goods arrived in Armenia from Azerbaijan and Georgia between midnight and 1523 on 23 October.

Armenian Unity Urged To Face Hostile Elements

NC2310154389 Yerevan KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN in Armenian 5 Oct 89 pp 3,4

[Article by Aramayis Saakyan entitled: "Armenians of All Countries Unite!"]

[Excerpts] Deep and mysterious disturbances are taking place in Soviet Union. The end of the century is similar to the beginning of the century. Agitation, rallies, sit-ins, demonstrations, hunger strikes, labor strikes, class strikes, interethnic fighting, blockades, conflagrations and accidents in transportation, and undermining of belief are everywhere.

People ask: "What is going to happen finally?" [passage omitted]. The openness struck a blow to the party and to Gorbachev and the situation became complicated. [passage omitted]. Living conditions did not improve, but became worse; justice did not triumph but was routed; the ethnic problem was not resolved, it became more entangled. Something bad emerged and with it the following bitter joke: "Because people have no sense of humor they accepted democracy seriously." Beliefs were shaken by an earthquake. People were fooled, and we were the first of them. Alas! In this complex world we remained simpleminded. [passage omitted]

History will judge today's events, just as we condemn the past. The organized Soviet press represented the organized Sumgait genocide in such a way and so praised the "humanist and Armenian-loving Azeris" that we were almost impelled to be thankful for the Soviet genocide of Sumgait. [passage omitted]. So far Moscow refuses to recognize the 1915 genocide. After all this we still believe that our just problem will be solved justly. We appeal to the culprit for assistance against the blockade. [passage omitted]. During the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow everyone voted in a secret ballot for Dzhafarov [first secretary of the Shushinskiy party rayon committee and a member of the Special Administration Committee of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO)] and not for Palayan [Armenian deputy from NKAO], though some of them express support for us vocally.

Instead of acting impartially the Christian leaders of the state more often than not side with the Muslims. Russia will be sorry for this. [passage omitted]. The treaties of San Stephano, Brest-Litovsk, Aleksandrapol, Kars, Moscow and Lausanne (in general all Russo-Turkish agreements) have been to the detriment of the Armenians. What do we expect any more? On what do we base our hopes? We occupy a mere one percent of the country at the very edge. From the goegraphical and historical viewpoint we are virtually in the mouth of the monster. We are unarmed, it is armed; it is protected but we are unprotected. It has plans, but we have neither a plan nor guns. We do not have even a national program. We should formulate a sober program based on reality; we must muster our forces and not panic. [passage omitted].

Suren Arutunyan's sharp statements are reviving the welcome idea of national unity. [passage omitted]. We Armenians are many, but not always united. [passage omitted]. Unfortunately, 60 unofficial organizations formed in motherland also are not unified. [passage omitted]. Today, above all, we need unity. Armenians need one single party: the Armenian People's Unity Party. [passage omitted].

We have often suffered for being internationalists. Lately we have often been described as "nationalist." [passage omitted]. As you see, being kind does not pay, and those who fear you are on good terms with you. In order to create fear we must be united and strong. This is the strongest weapon, and precisely why they undermine our unity. We must urgently issue "the manifesto of the Armenian people addressed to all peoples of the world." [passage omitted].

Armenians Thank Ukrainians for Help

LD2110182189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Text] The Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Council of Ministers of the republic, have sent a telegram to the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Council of Ministers, and the working people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The message says, in particular: In the hour of severe trials for the people of Armenia, when destructive natural forces have afflicted our land, the Ukrainian people which have themselves lived through the pain of Chernobyl, were among the first to extend a helping hand to us. Despite the difficulties caused by the remoteness of the fraternal republic, and the problem of delivering freight, Ukrainian builders honorably discharged the commitments they had undertaken. The plan for construction and assembly work for 9 months of the year was overfulfilled. In the countryside, 80,000 sq m of housing was commissioned, which exceeds the target for the year stipulated by a decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers. Particularly great successes were achieved by rural builders working in (Gukasyanskiy) and (Amasiyskiy) rayons.

On behalf of the working people of Armenia, the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party, the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Council of Ministers, expressed profound gratitude to the people of the Ukraine for their selfless internationalist assistance and fraternal support.

Armenians Commemorate U.S. Quake Victims

NC2310162689 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 22 Oct 89

[Text] Dear compatriots, a memorial ceremony was held today in Edzhmiatsin Cathedral for the San Francisco earthquake victims. The ceremony was officiated by [word indistinct] Armenian Archbishop Asaturyan.

In his sermon, Vazgen I, Catholicos of all Armenians, talked about the disastrous earthquake.

For the first time, the memorial and holy ceremony was carried on Armenian radio.

Crimeans Protest Nuclear Power Plant Construction

PM1210103789 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 29 Sep 89 p 1

[O. Pronina report under the rubric: "Under PRAVDA UKRAINY Supervision": ""The Crimea and AES's Are

Incompatible!' Declaimed the Participants in a Mass Rally 27 September in Simferopol's Central Square"]

[Text] In connection with the approach of the commissioning date for the first power unit of the Crimean nuclear electric power station [AES] the situation in the oblast deteriorated so much that the Crimean Oblast Trade Union Council was forced to send a teleprinter message 24 September to the USSR Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation, and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU], saying that further delays in resolving the question of suspending the AES' construction and reconfiguration threaten a warning strike.

In the morning of 27 September, before the start of the 12th session of the oblast soviet, its deputies were greeted by picketers around the oblast soviet executive committee [oblispolkom] building. They demanded the fulfillment of the session's decision dated 19 April this year to suspend the construction and reconfiguration of the AES. V.D. Arbuzov, chairman of the oblast trade union council, acquainted the picketers with the response from the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation, which said, in part, that the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources planned to examine the question of the advisability of building the Crimean AES in October 1989. The USSR State Committee for Protection of the Environment is at present embarking on an ecological examination of the construction project.

In turn the leaders of construction work at the AES asked the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU to condemn the actions of the Crimean Oblast Trade Union Council, which allegedly provoked the strike movement.

More than 300,000 Crimeans who signed an appeal to the government for construction work to be suspended at the AES expressed readiness to organize a human chain from Lenin Square in Simferopol to the AES to prevent the delivery of nuclear fuel.

"The realities today," V.D. Arbuzov said during a session recess, "are such that even the actual formulation of the question of whether there will be an AES in the Crimea or not is senseless. Every sensible person realizes the criminality of this idea. However, the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation is still unyielding. If the government and the ministry are convinced that there should not be an AES in the Crimea, why are they delaying, fueling a situation that is already charged to the limit? We will not make people happy if we decide for them how they are to live in the future. That is why I must reiterate once again that it is public pressure that compels us, after preliminary consultations with labor collectives via sector trade unions, to give the go-ahead to a 1-hour warning strike outside work time if no concrete decision is made regarding the AES. One that, naturally, takes into consideration all the problems of people working there. We did not urge anyone to strike and we have no intention of urging anyone to do so. That is an extreme and undesirable measure."

However, the events of 27 September showed that at any moment the situation may escape the control of not only the organs of power but also of public organizations in charge of the Crimean antinuclear movement. Despite the appeals from the pickets' organizers to observe calm and order, the peaceful picket became a mass spontaneous rally lasting several hours.

"In order to avoid disturbances, there was nothing left but to sanction the rally," B.V. Babyuk, deputy chief of the oblispolkom internal affairs administration, commented on the situation.

All the oblast soviet deputies share the concern for the future of the Crimea. V.V. Kurashik, deputy chairman of the oblispolkom, who took part in the work of all the government commissions on the AES, informed the participants in the session about the state of affairs and the soviet's steps to halt construction. The session's participants sent a cable to the country's government on the same day demanding an immediate response to the request from USSR People's Deputy A.N. Girenko regarding the construction of the Crimean AES. The session also instructed the USSR Bank for Industrial Construction oblast administration to stop financing the industrial construction of the AES.

Science Academy Opposes Crimean AES

90UN0068B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 5 Oct 89 p 3

["Declaration by the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences"; adopted at a meeting of the Presidium of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] The Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] believes that at the present stage of development of scientific-technical progress the problem of stabilization and improvement of the ecological situation in our republic is a priority. The impact of technology on the environment is already beginning to exceed reasonable limits.

The desire to continue the construction of new AES [nuclear power station] units in the territory of the republic before new regulations on the siting of the AES are introduced, without taking into account the real situation, gives rise to particular concern.

Continuation of the construction of the Crimean AES causes the the greatest alarm. Geological and seismic surveys in recent years carried out with the most vigorous participation of specialists from the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the USSR Mingeo [Ministry of Geology] have established that the site of the station happens to be in the zone of 9-point [earthquakes]; taking into account the load of technological origin and peculiarities of the engineering and hydrogeological situation associated with building the station (the rise registered in the ground water table and reduced strength of the ground under the station) the point rating of eventual earthquakes may increase to 10 points. In addition, the area of the AES is susceptible to the phenomena of contemporary diapirism (i.e., incidence of mud volcanoes) the consequences of which may exceed the expected seismic impact. All of the above new facts have been the subject of a profound analysis by a commission headed by Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Academy Member Ye.P. Velikhov, which was set up last year, and have been taken into account by this commission.

The conclusions of the commission, in the proceedings of which the scientists of the Ukraine participated vigorously, were extensively discussed at the conferences of geologists and geophysicists of the USSR Academy of Sciences prior to their final formulation.

In the opinion of the Presidium of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences, the construction of the Crimean AES should be discontinued, and it cannot be commissioned. This will inflict considerable damage on the fragile ecological systems of the peninsula which are already burdened by large-scale irrigation, intensive use of chemicals in agriculture, and construction of still new chemical industry facilities.

The Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the prudent use of available energy resources, application of energy-efficient technologies, development of research-intensive industries, and a search for alternative energy sources are the most acceptable way for developing the supply of energy to the national economy which has proven itself in many industrially developed countries rather than the boundless increase in power-generating capacity, including nuclear power stations.

Proceeding firmly from the positions of perestroyka and glasnost, expressing the interests of the population of the republic, and being concerned about its future, the Presidium of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences states in the present declaration its attitude toward the construction of the Crimean AES and believes it necessary to give to the republic the right to determine independently the ways of development of its fuel and energy complex and the structure of its national economy.

Discrepancies in Ukrainian Plenum Coverage

PM2310172089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondents M. Odinets, I. Tikhomirov report under the rubric "From the Latest Mail": "The Official Filter Again"]

[Text] Kiev—For 3 days now the telephone has been ringing constantly at PRAVDA's office in Kiev. The same question is asked again and again: Why does the report from the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum published in PRAVDA give a different account of the facts from the report of the same plenum published in the republican newspapers?

What can we say? It is only a question of one speech—the speech by A. Zonenko, editor of the newspaper PRAVDA UKRAINY. He sharply critized Ya. Pogrebnyak, candidate member of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Lvov Oblast party committee. Our newspaper reported this. The RATAU report published by the local newspapers, including PRAVDA UKRAINY, in its account of editor A. Zonenko's speech, not only contains no criticism of Pogrebnyak, but does not even mention his name.

The perplexity felt by those telephoning our office in connection with the discrepancy in the newspapers' coverage of the plenums is exacerbated by the fact that Ukrainian Television, when transmitting the sessions, showed all those who delivered speeches, except A. Zonenko.

In past times such cuts and abbreviations were common practice, and furthermore the abbreviation NFP—"not for publication"—in the margins of reports and speeches legitimized the official filtering of information. But can that be possible now, when the word "glasnost" was heard repeatedly at that very same plenum?

Apparently it can.

But how are we to explain it to the perplexed newspaper readers and television viewers?

Moldavian Front's March Causes Disturbances

LD2310180389 Moscow TASS in Engish 1706 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Kishinev October 23 ATEM-TASS—Many thousands of people took to the streets last Sunday [22 October] to take part in an authorised meeting and march in the central "Victory Square" in Kishinev, capital of Soviet Moldavia.

The meeting and the march caused considerable disturbance and mass violations of the peace.

The board of the Moldavian Popular Front declined to wait for the official sanction after submitting to the city authorities an application to hold a meeting. It notified the population of the forthcoming gathering through its official publication—the newspaper "POPULAR EDUCATION".

The Executive Committee of the Frunzensky District Council of People's Deputies considered the application and refused to authorize the event in the city's central square.

The committee acted in accordance with the decision of July 13, 1989. The decision stated that the Council of People's Deputies considered it unadvisable to hold meetings and marches, other than national holiday demonstrations, in the Victory Square and adjacent streets.

The Executive Committee suggested that the Popular Front hold its meeting at the republican stadium or in the city's summer (open air) theatre, where functions of this kind were usually staged.

Despite this, crowds of supporters of the Moldavian Popular Front filled the central square around noon on October 22. Carrying slogans and tri-coloured flags, they marched along the central street in the Moldavian capital towards Vossoyedinenya (Reunification) Square.

One of slogans, reading "Unici Ve" (Unite), preceeded a map of the republic on which new repubican borders were clearly visible.

The march brought the traffic in the Lenin Avenue to a halt. Some people were beaten up, a correspondent of the republican news agency "ATEM" was surrounded by several dozen people when he was taking snapshots of the march. The camera was snatched from his hands and the film exposed. The man received several blows.

Belorussian Language Bill Submitted to Parliament

LD2010154989 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 20 Oct 89

[Text] Minsk October 20 TASS—A bill on the Belorussian language state status has been submitted to the Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium. It was drafted by the Parliament's commission for proposals on legislative regulation of the status of the Belorussian, Russian and other languages spoken by the 10 million-strong republican population, and the Belorussian language society named after enlightener and pioneer of printing Francisk Skorina, which was formed in June. The bill will be submitted for a nation-wide discussion after it is passed at the Belorussian Supreme Soviet's next session.

"A possibility for the free development of the national language in the state and social spheres of the republic is opening for the third time of the Great Lithuanian Principality and in the 1920s'," society chairman, writer Nil Gilevich, told TASS. "There is hope that the Belorussian language will acquire a state status for ever this time."

Gilevich is known to readers not only by his literary activities but also by impassioned speeches at different forums—from the republican parliament sessions to the Soviet writers' congress on problems of revival of the Belorussian language.

Only 77 percent of the Belorussians now speak their native language (79.4 percent of the republican population), he said. 14 percent of pubils attend Belorussian language schools. The first schools with tuition in the national language opened in towns in the new school year. There were only a few such schools in villages before. And there were no such schools in towns.

"The law on the state status of the Belorussian language in the republic should be endorsed now that the world is witnessing a real ethnic renaissance, with Slavic language peoples coming to mutual understanding and unity owing to growing national self-awareness and development of national cultures," Gilevich said.

Lithuanian Party's Independence Examined

LD2410131089 Vilnius LITERATURA IR MENAS in Lithuanian No 41, 7 Oct 89 p 2

[Speech by Writer, Leonidas Jacinevicius, given at Lithuanian Writers' Association Party meeting, entitled "To Cross The Rubicon."]

[Text] The 7 September issue of the weekly, ZA RUBEZHOM, carried a commentary from the Swedish newspaper, SVENSKA DAGBLADET," of an interview, with Vytautas Landsbergis, by the WASHINGTON POST. The Swedes comment: "In the event the Baltics were given the right to leave the Soviet Union, we would undoubtedly witness the USSR's disintegration. This type of reverse movement, in our part of the world may well give rise to catastrophic consequences. Sympathies must not change reality." Having read Saturday's KOMJAUNIMO TIESA interview with Justas Paleckis, it becomes clear how Lithuanians who live in Sweden regard the political processes presently taking place in our Republic.

This does not give cause for optimism, since West Germany and the United States hold a similar view. Baltic rebirth processes, are analyzed abroad, in the very wide context of East-West relations. Owing to our provincial conceit, we attempt, at times, to ignore this world political context, imagining ourselves almost at the world's center. It is sad to attest, that, for the time being, we are, to those abroad, only an interesting attraction whose conclusion is not predictable. Even those foreigners, who sympathize with us, often recall the recent events in China, while it is common knowledge that the Asiatic repression tradition is especially tenacious. This is also exemplified by the Central Committee CPSU declaration, where an unambiguous appeal is directed toward Baltic mothers and women, calling to mind possible catastrophic consequences for their children.

It is not difficult to discern that the inspirers of the Central Committee CPSU document are in the same conservative force apparatus that has this time also forced M. Gorbachev to listen. Contradictions are becoming increasingly apparent in his view of the Baltic: On the one hand, he is interested in the Baltic as a proving ground for testing progressive ideas; on the other, he is concerned with maintaining a unified and undivided empire.

The Central Press and TV are actively creating an image of the enemy in the Baltics.

These then, are the conditions under which the Lithuanian CP is preparing to convoke an extraordinary party congress, to deliberate Lithuanian CP's self governing status, new program and laws. This would constitute the crossing of the last Rubicon and, I am certain, Moscow will attempt not to allow it under any circumstances. Especially, in view of the fact that the Ukraine is now stirring from its stagnational slumber, and Belorussia and Moldavia are beginning to express their rights. A separation by the Lithuanian CP would set a precedent for other republics, but the omnipotent apparatus is not going to allow a weakening in the party dictatorship, even if it came to sacrificing Mikhail Sergeyevich, himself.

A nations's quest of liberty is never too late or too early, however. More than half of (the KOMJAUNIMO TIESA newspaper's sociological poll respondents) Lithuanian Communists are fully aware of the fact, that CPSU will contine to impose economic and ideological oppression, even under the existence of purported economic independence, if the Lithuanian CP fails to win self-determination and will not decide to maintain relations with the CPSU on a parity basis. There is no other alternative, since any other direction would constitute a midway stop; long years of pussyfooting in one spot and glancing at the center will ensue while the Lithuanian CP slogan: "Lithuania without sovereignty—is Lithuania without a future," will of necessity, have to be fearfully tucked away in the deepest of chests.

First Secretary A. Brazauskas in an interview with journalist B. Rupeika stated that current public movements should renounce the following two slogans: one, "On leaving the USSR," the other—"Occupiers, get out of Lithuania!" In truth, being mindful of the great goals before us, in this case—the extraordinary Lithuanian CP Congress and the Lithuanian CP self-determination status, it would behoove us to manifest basic intelligence, especially so for members of the press. Let us assist people in attaining more freedom from within, but not by using phrases that arouse the center, while we savor them and try to compete with one another; let us proceed along a different road, one of encouraging the Lithuanian citizen to develop a sense of his own worth, of expanding the area of his tolerance and of freeing his political know how from provincialism. The intellectual forces within the Republic will thus assist in overcoming the slave syndrome, and no warning visits to Lithuania by high military officials will be capable of reviving it.

M. Gorbachev, in his Saturday television address, marked a very important moment in restructuring—the joining of political life, by the wide-ranging working masses. I had the feeling an attempt was being made once more to place the workers' class before the intelligentsia, in other words, the old party mythology was seized upon once more. It was also stated that it was useful for someone to discredit restructuring. The first one to discredit it, however, is the CPSU who has discredited itself. This is why an independent Lithuanian Communist Party alone can be the authoritative force if it is to pursue goals in union with the nation.

Lithuania Introduces Travel Restrictions

LD2410092489 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Summary] Beginning today, 21 October, only one private visit to a socialist country per year will be allowed. The same applies to those visiting Lithuania. The so-called tourism without exchanging hard currency, which until now has been widespread, is now banned. Tourist trips must now be arranged only through Intourist, the Committee for Tourism, and official exchange of foreign currency must also be arranged through it.

The Lithuanian Communications Ministry has been instructed to stop sending parcels from Lithuania to Poland. One of the two tourist trains going to Poland has now been cancelled.

These measures have been adopted by the Lithuanian Council of Ministersto protect the domestic market and counter speculation.

'Radio Free Europe's' Policies Questioned

LD1910132089 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 20 Aug 89 p 3

[Article by Vilius Kavaliauskas, deputy chairman, Administration, Lithuanian Journalists' Association, entitled "Is 'Free Europe' Free?," under the rubric, "Marginal Notes."]

[Text] The Lithuanian Journalists' Association is planning to hold a World Lithuanian Journalists Congress in Vilnius, next year. We are attempting to popularize this project, by every means possible, among those of our countrymen, who work for the press.

Several days ago, while on an assignment in Munich, I called the Lithuanian editorial office of "Free Europe." I told them about the journalists' plans and also asked them for their help—I had come to FRG in search of more current material on the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and perhaps the Munich Lithuanian journalists, who I have heard, have at their disposal, a marvelous library, that had been assembled in "Freedom," and "Free Europe," could perhaps lend me a hand. I also wanted to meet "Free Europe's" colleagues.

I was very much surprised, when the person I spoke to, (I will not mention his name, since I don't think he was expressing his personal opinion) categorically refused to help me: "We are prohibited from discussing any type of questions, with outsiders...."

I tried to appeal to his professional solidarity, I even reminded him of our warm comradely meeting at the Lithuanian editorial office of "Voice Of America," in Washington. However, that was to no avail, either.

Our "Free Europe" colleagues might say, we forget our history much too quickly. Perhaps we do. Exactly 10 years ago, while on a visit to Cologne, our guide anounced that a visit to the "German Wave" Radio

Station had been included on our itinerary. Our leader, who was, even for those times, too conscientious a protector of our political decency, even threw up his hands: "A definite provocation!" That was the last time I was forbidden to meet with my colleague journalists.

In those 10 years we have overcome our fear syndrome. Our colleagues in Munich have not yet accomplished this.

Christmas Declared Legal Holiday in Lithuania

LD2210104689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 22 Oct 89

[Text] Let us continue the bulletin with news from Lithuania. A decree of the Republic's Supreme Soviet has declared 01 Novemer, All Saints Day, and 25 December, Christmas Day, to be festival days. This has been done at the suggestion of the population, the working collectives, public organizations and movements of the Republic—Sajudis, the Secretary of the Presidium of Lithuania's supreme body of power, told journalists. For the first time in the postwar period Christmas Day has been declared a holiday by legislation. There is also an age-old popular tradition in Lithuania of remembering the departed.

Latvians Seek Guarantees of Republic Sovereignty

PM2310140789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent I. Litvinova report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Amendments to the Constitution Are Proposed"]

[Text] Riga—The Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has published proposals approved by deputies on the introduction of amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution. They envisage the decisive decentralization of the Union "by delimiting and redistributing authority in favor of the union republics and forming an efficient legal mechanism to coordinate the interests of the USSR and the union republics."

In the opinion of the authors of the proposals, a number of articles in the USSR Constitution now in effect prevent the union republics from exercising their rights as sovereign states. It is proposed to redistribute the powers in such a way that the union republics can implement the full range of state power on their own territory. The underlying principle is that "the union republics are primary, and the federation is derivative. Only the republics can hand over to the Union or reclaim specific powers, because it is the republics that created the great Union."

It is proposed to enshrine in the appropriate article of the USSR Constitution that, if there are divergences between acts of the USSR state administration and union republic laws, it is the laws of the union republic that have precedence. The proposals raise the question of legal guarantees of republics' sovereignty, among them particularly the right to ratify the USSR Constitution and USSR laws. A number of changes are proposed to articles of the Constitution which determine types of ownership, the electoral system, and the election of the republic prosecutor.

Latvian Peoples Front Draft Program Criticized

90UN0019A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Oct 89 Second p 3

[Report on interview with USSR People's Deputy Viktor Alksnis by T. Karyakina: "I Believe in the Intelligence of the People"; date and place not specified]

[Text] USSR People's Deputy Viktor Alksnis reflects on the platform for CPSU nationalities policy.

[Alksnis] For me personally, the platform of the CPSU nationalities policy adopted at the Central Committee September Plenum is of fundamental importance. It reflects many of my own thoughts that I shared with my own voters both during the spring election campaign and later. The hopes and aspirations of my fellow countrymen who supported me resound in this timely document. I am also happy because I understand that a fine sowing of party nationalities policy has been made not only in a single soil and not just in good weather. We need serious and prolonged work in order to prevent the weeds of nationalist and separatist sentiments making themselves felt in my homeland—Latvia. I am acutely aware of this when I compare two documents that are today being studied throughout the entire country, namely, the party platform, and the other, a document that is, so to speak, local in nature—the fresh draft of the Latvian People's Front [LPF] platform.

More than a year ago the sponsors of this movement called themselves warriors of perestroyka. They know that among the people great hopes are being placed in perestroyka, and it is therefore not surprising that people have been drawn to the LPF. Hopes for something new at the local level have not been immediately shaped into a clear-cut political arrangement, and the latter-day saviors of the people have taken advantage of this interim. Who stands on the path of the burgeoning of national forces? This is the rhetorical question that they have asked, and answered: the bureaucrats from the center. They have decked out those bureaucrats rather quickly in Russian national costume and have firmly linked them in general with the Russian people. They have started to instill methodically into the consciousness of the people the image of an aggressive, grasping and lazy people of poor intellect. The more all kinds of nationalist gatherings take place, the more hard-hearted has been the sound of propaganda against the union of people, and the more open the leaders of the LPF have been in casting aside their mask of fighters for perestroyka.

A nationalist mine is being placed beneath perestroyka, essentially negating the development of the republic within the USSR. And even though the proposed LPF program is interspersed with masking phrases about "the impermissibility of racial and national hatred and intolerance," and about right to existence and equal rights for the actions "of all democratic parties and sociopolitical formations," there is no doubt about the ultimate goal of those who authored this document: it is to interpret self-determination for the republic as separation. How else is it possible to explain the following postulate in the draft program: "to halt the activity of organizations and parties organizationally subordinate to the USSR"?

[Karyakina] How does the LPF substantiate itself in economic terms, when today Latvia's life's blood is part of a common system with the USSR? Will this not be a hard adaptation?

[Alksnis] In their draft all landmarks look toward the West, from training for experts in "the world's leading economic schools," to the attraction of "capital investments from foreign entrepreneurs, particularly Latvians living abroad." And the introduction of their own monetary system. This closes the circle. But of course all these dreams about a rich uncle abroad are self-deception. Well, who will assume the repayment that the USSR makes for Latvia—some 96 percent of Latvia's fuel needs, 50 percent of its electric power, 50 percent of its ferrous metals and 100 percent of its nonferrous metals, 80 percent of its raw materials and chemicals, 63 percent of its machine building? Perhaps these figures, publicized from the dais of the CPSU Central Committee plenum, will somehow be of some concern to the proponents of separatism?

It must be said that sensible people in the republic are well aware of how we live and of the situation in which we find ourselves. I have had to explain repeatedly to opponents from the LPF that we are producing expensive industrial output from cheap raw materials essentially through the heavy labor of Uzbek children and women. But what if our egocentrism permeates to Tyumen, which supplies us with oil and gas for next to nothing, what if it also raises the question of bringing prices into line with world prices? Will we manage...? No, this kind of support is quite normal, but they think that even under the conditions of "independence" everything will be exactly the same.

But how much can we try the patience of others? For outworn politicians are in fact setting the Russian-speaking population in the republic against themselves. It is alarming to sense a real threat that their civic rights will be restricted. I personally fear that as a result of parliamentary tricks we have almost reached the position of being a small totalitarian state in which the cruelest national repression will be exercised.

[Karyakina] It is still difficult to imagine that the LPF ideologues managed without the sobering advice of the economists when they were drawing up their strategic positions....

[Alksnis] I am not intimately acquainted with finer points of the LPF kitchen. But what they have proposed today matches very well the level of the demands of one of the leaders in the movement for so-called national independence, namely, Eynars Repshi, who says, let us first move ahead and then we shall see what will happen. This is the pure water of adventurism! Serious economists are saying that an experiment in adventurism could become a tragedy for the Latvian people.

As a deputy I often meet with the voters. I make assert boldly that by no means all of them believe in the beautiful fairy story about the golden age of bourgeois Latvia or support the position of the LPF that our common goal is to "restore Latvia's state independence and create a democratic parliamentary republic, continuing the democratic traditions of the Latvian republic." I recall what one old Latvian admitted: "I was unemployed and literally dying of hunger, and I do not want to return to those years." But they want to go back; it is not happenstance that there is not a word in the LPF program about socialism, but the "full citizen" of the new Latvia is promised a place in the European home along with the "civilized Europeans of the North."

I am convinced that what we are dealing with here is a precisely organized ideological machine, based outside the boundaries of the state, which is delicately catching the balance of political forces and the mood of society and reacting instantaneously to changes. I draw this conclusion by again comparing the emphasis of the two versions of the LPF program. New formulations of goals have already emerged. For example, the question of Latvia's independence: even within the framework of this independence the LPF this time guarantees "equal rights and equal existence for all peoples that support the ideas of independence." Masked, but unambiguous: the right to citizenship is acquired in exchange for support for the idea of separation..

[Karyakina] What, notwithstanding, opposes this program?

[Alksnis] We now have a serious alternative—the CPSU nationalities platform, with its strict logic, candid assessment of the events that have darkened our history, and a clear-cut program for the future. As a deputy I personally will do everything possible to achieve a situation in which the workers in my republic live in a renewed federation of equal Soviet republics where, as was stated at the plenum, the constitutional principle of the equality of citizens regardless of racial, religious, or national affiliation will be fully and consistently realized.

But I would not call for opposition; this is a form of "walls on a wall." There is the Interfront of the workers of the Latvian SSR—an organization that to some extent reflects the interests of the foreign language-speaking section of the population. But in my opinion, just as the LPF cannot satisfy the aspirations of each Latvian, so too Interfront cannot do it for the Russian-speaking people. But how can we make a categorical judgment about this if for us pluralism is a one-way street? For to judge from information in the newspapers no longer subordinate to party organs, the LPF is 100-percent Latvian and favors secession from the USSR. But who knows what is going on in the souls of those people who have now either been hypnotized or frightened and often fear to express their opinions openly? For whoever dares to speak out openly against the generally accepted ideology will be subjected to moral terror. This is actually happening: today we are dealing decisively with people who think differently.

[Karyakina] How then does this line up with the democratic appeals that bestrew the People's Front draft program?

[Alksnis] This is a paradox. In words, pluralism of opinion is being preached, but in fact it is the Stalinist principle: "Whoever is not with us is against us." Take, for example, this thesis of the program: "The LPF is fighting for representatives of the people of Latvia who show an unambiguous desire to establish state independence for Latvia to be elected to higher and local organs." This is already a gentle hint: if you move along the path indicated by it, then fine; if not, then give up your dreams of democratic representation in the parliament of the new Latvia.

As a Latvian I am in sympathy with and understand the emphasis in the new USSR language policy, where the fundamental principle will be the free development toward equality of all languages and voluntary choice of the language of teaching. For there is no contradiction between national interests and that provision of the platform that states that it is advisable to adopt as the official language the language of the nationality that gives its name to the all-union or autonomous republic. But the People's Front has relied on separation. Renewed Soviet federation, whose taste we still do not know, is being rejected by them out of hand. And self-determination is being presented merely as the sauce of separation. The plenum rightly said that under present-day conditions the desire for autarchy and attempts to to isolate the successful republics and oblasts and set them apart from the others are extremely dangerous.

[Karyakina] Your term as a deputy still has a long time to run. How would you like to use it?

[Alksnis] Both as a deputy and as a communist I will work for a new and equal federation of the all-union republics. It will now be easier to accomplish this since we have a clear-cut program for national policy. I am for political solutions to urgent problems and I believe that approaches to these solutions will have a place in the new USSR Constitution; as a deputy from one of the Baltic republics I would like to be directly involved in the work on the new constitution. I would like future laws of the USSR to address human rights more clearly and unambiguously. None of us in the government can be offended by the fact of our affiliation to a particular nationality. We are obligated to bring the perestroyka that has been initiated to a conclusion and to develop a broad movement toward a civilized USSR. Here we need good laws; lawlessness will be too costly. I make this judgment from first hand experience.

[Karyakina] Has your fate been directly affected?

[Alksnis] Our family experienced all the horrors of Stalinism. My grandfather was a deputy people's commissar of defense and chief of Red Army Air Forces. My family lived in Moscow, in a fine house down by the river. On 23 November 1937 my grandfather was arrested, and my grandmother a day later. My father was left alone and I was sent to a children's home. Then at the beginning of the war I was in Siberia, in Kemerovo Oblast, and I worked there in a mine until 1957. In 1957 after rehabilitation we found our grandmother and went to Riga. My family has seen many dark days. Earlier it was impossible to speak of it. But even this part of our complicated history has been assessed in the CPSU nationalities platform.

I am an optimist and I hope that the common sense and intelligence of the Latvian people and of other people will prevail over the absurd, and that history will put everything in its proper place. But for this we need active work and we must clear away the obstacles that have piled up in interethnic relations.

Vagris Discusses Latvian Communist Party CC Plenum

Analyzes Results

PM2009095389 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 6 Sep 89 pp 1, 2

[LATINFORM report on interview with Ya.Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee [CC], by television journalist Aldis Neymanis on the "Leadership's Opinion" program broadcast on 31 August 1989: "There Can Be No Sovereign Latvia Without Perestroyka, There Can Be No Perestroyka Without Sovereign Latvia!"—first paragraph is an introduction]

[Excerpts] Ya.Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the latest program in the "Leadership's Opinion" television series on 31 August. In a conversation with television journalist Aldis Neymanis, and in reply to questions by numerous television viewers, Comrade Vagris analyzed the results of the latest Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum and the most substantive principles of the republican Communist Party's action program. A significant part of the conversation was devoted to a broad range of questions concerning the 26 August CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics and the discussion of the statement in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. In view of the fact that the problems in question are of interests to many Communists and residents of the republic, we publish an account of the conversation which took place. [passage omitted]

[Vagris] [passage omitted] We concluded a plenum, a real marathon plenum, which was to a certain extent unique. As far as I can remember, plenums have never been prepared in such a fashion. I am actually talking about form, because virtually all party organizations in the republic took part in preparations for the plenum. This was followed by 2 days—10-11 August—of debate. We then adjourned, and an editorial commission set up at the plenum's first stage was at work during the adjournment. Yesterday the editorial commission reported on the results of its work. And the Latvian Communist Party's action program was adopted. It will be published in the press. All television viewers and radio listeners who followed the course of the plenum's work yesterday will be able to study it.

But the program has not yet been published, and therefore I shall briefly mention some of its basic principles, not all of them of course, since people will be able to read them for themselves. Our program's title is "Along the Path to Latvia's Sovereignty." Its foundation is provided by the decisions of the 12th session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation; in other words we are talking about Latvia as a sovereign republic, a sovereign state within the USSR. We clearly realize—and this was said at the plenum yesterday—that there can be no sovereign Latvia without perestroyka, nor can there be perestroyka without a sovereign Latvia. This is one of the main principles.

I would like to note that the action program is based on observance of the principle of a nation's right to self-determination.

To continue—about the new status of the Latvian Communist Party, befitting a qualitatively new and sovereign state. The Latvian Communist Party will certainly remain a part of the CPSU. We discussed its future status at the plenum. But we found ourselves unable to agree on any specific alternative either in commission or at yesterday's plenum. Maybe the word "unable" is not quite correct. We certainly did not strive to opt for just one alternative even though this was proposed, we wished to leave scope for future debate. We thus left two alternatives of the Communist Party's future status open to discussion. This question is due to be discussed by all Communists before the scheduled 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress, which will be held in about 1 year's time. [passage omitted]

[Neymanis] [passage omitted] Many viewers ask: Do you envisage the possibility of the republic withdrawing from the USSR? Television viewers ask this mainly in connection with the 31 May appeal by the Latvian People's Front Duma Board.

[Vagris] Similar questions have been asked recently, and not just in connection with the 31 May appeal. The Latvian National Independence Movement [LNIM], for example, has made this its goal. Thus, the question is certainly not new. Politics is the art of taking advantage of real opportunities—this is more or less what someone said in the past. I believe that anyone wishing to be a real politician rather than just a political demagogue must look at things realistically, with both feet on the ground. I cannot perceive, either today or tomorrow, any opportunity for Latvia to exist normally outside the Soviet Union. Yes, many vivid and sparklingly attractive slogans have been put forward, but they are totally unfounded, they lack any sensible program. There is a multitude of sundry promises and suppositions, but nothing is being said about what is to be done and how it is to be done, about how we will live and where we will get the money from. Following the principle: Let's get out, and then we'll see; this is not a serious approach, you know. It is much better to soberly examine and ponder the way we do our specific practical work right now, as part of the Soviet Union. After all, certain results have already been achieved, even if nothing more than the fact that, starting 1 January 1990, we will start living and working in conditions of republican economic autonomy.

There are clear-cut and realistic tenets expressed, for example, in the speeches by Comrades Gorbunov and Bresis at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies in Moscow on what has to be changed in, say, all-Union or our own republican legislation. We thus have our own realistic and specific path which we are following. I would not like to say that it is easy or will be like a bed of roses, as the saying goes. But we have at least a realistic idea of where we are going and what we wish to achieve. But to put it so simply—let's get out and that's that—this is not the way to toy with the people's future. There are many sundry illusions, totally groundless hopes. Like, for example, that the West will supposedly help us. I do not know whether this is a case of specific lies or naive ignorance of the West's real stance on this issue. Yes, individual persons or some social organizations in their statements support and even encourage this, promising all sorts of aid, but the foreign press, as well as our own press and other sources, have recently made it quite clear that statements by official bodies and persons are very muted in this regard. It is, after all, obvious that the West is interested in the vast union market, and if we were to split and separate ourselves the West would hardly find it profitable to, for example, use our ports to move its goods and to pay customs duties twice, never mind all the rest. They will find other ports and other opportunities to enter the Union market directly and it could happen that we would find ourselves altogether on our own. Thus, illusions are nothing more than that, we must deal with reality. I therefore believe that it is necessary to take advantage of the unique opportunities now being offered to us by perestroyka, and we must not forget that it was not we who launched it, that it was certainly not launched in Riga. A lot of work lies ahead, the proclaimed sovereignty must be given real content. Maybe I am repeating myself. I have said this on so many occasions before. It seems to me that I already said in our previous conversation that the thesis that every Soviet republic is a sovereign state must be given the proper content.

[Neymanis] And so, down to realities. The CPSU Central Committee statement, which generated a stormy reaction, is also a reality. Almost every question by viewers touches on this statement. Let us, for example, go no further than this one: How would Comrade Vagris comment on the Estonian Communist Party resolution on the 26 August statement, seeing that, in the television viewer's opinion, it contains ideas contrary to similar statements in Lithuania and Latvia?

[Vagris] Contrary? I would not say so. No, talking of what I know and what has been published, I would not say that the opinions are contrary. Rather the reverse. I think that our evaluations coincide in principle, along general lines. It is, however, true that the mailbag on this question is already huge and contains diametrically opposed points of view. Some people totally support the CPSU Central Committee's 26 August statement. Others do so only partially, rejecting only a series of finer points. Yet others totally reject the statement in question. We expressed the Central Committee's opinion in an announcement by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, and yesterday's Central Committee plenum adopted an address which will be published in the press tomorrow (1 September—Editorial Office note). I think that in this case we ought to really weigh our appraisals. It is certainly impossible to claim that the matters of which the statement talks do not exist and have never existed in the republic. This would be unobjective and untrue. After all, there are obvious separatist trends, for example, we have only just discussed them. We do have manifestations of extremism, especially taking the form of slanderous, defamatory, and scabrously gross public—I emphasize—public statements against the republic's Supreme Soviet, the government, the party, and the Soviet Army.

It is not worth propagandizing such matters, but I would nonetheless like to cite just one example so as to give viewers an idea of what I mean. I would therefore like to somewhat clarify the matter of 23 August. It seems to me that there are no complaints at all about the "Baltic Chain" action as such in Latvian territory. Indeed—in our republic at least and as far as I know—the action was held in an organized and emotional fashion. I would even say on an upbeat note and in a spirit of good will. If someone were to specifically condemn the action as such and the way it was held in our republic's territory, I would think that this someone is simply a person unable to understand something or unwilling to understand. But the rally held at the Freedom Monument later on in the evening was an altogether different matter. It was organized by the LNIM, the rally was not sanctioned, and numerous totally unacceptable statements were made there.

I shall quote just one for the television viewers' benefit. LNIM Member Edvin Yansons uttered the following, among sundry other abuses and slanders: "Communist Party members deserve the hangman's noose." I cannot describe this as anything else but extremism. Of course, I have no intention of quoting any more but the general idea was that enough soap will be found to grease the noose for Communists and they all will be hung. But is this not a manifestation of extremism? It is, therefore, impossible to claim that there are absolutely no grounds for the very sharp wording of the CPSU Central Committee statement. It is perfectly understandable that the CPSU Central Committee has developed a concern, say, or maybe even fear in connection with the perestroyka processes. It would be more accurate to say: Not in connection with the perestroyka processes as a whole, but as a result of a few negative aspects which have developed during the process of perestroyka. At the same time, however, we in the Central Committee receive very many statements, letters, telegrams, and other materials, in the overwhelming majority of which people express their incomprehension. Let me say that this is basically caused by the fact that all Baltic republics seem to have been lumped together in the statement in question.

Meanwhile, you said that there are rather numerous questions complaining that Vagris is trying to drive some sort of wedge between the Baltic republics. Anyone who heard the interview with Comrade Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, on the "Vremya" program the day before yesterday, I think, must have noticed that he emphasized approximately the same aspects. It is hardly appropriate to reduce everything to a matter of driving wedges.

Although the Baltic republics as a whole certainly have a lot in common, every republic nonetheless has its own image and its own specific features. And the degree to which processes in each republic have been exacerbated is very individual. Ignorance of this truth engenders incomprehension, and obviously is one of the main reasons behind the extremely sharp appraisal in the statement. By way of a second reason, I would cite the fact that the statement in question persistently and frequently repeats the words "nationalism" and "nationalists." This is my subjective opinion, and I may be wrong, but Soviet Latvia's indigenous residents have developed a certain allergy toward such terms, because all this is immediately associated with the Central Committee July 1959 plenum and its consequences. This fact is highly important in our republic and it aggravates the situation. [passage omitted]

Writer P. Afanasyev on Baltic Republics

PM2010160089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Moscow writer Platon Afanasyev by unnamed correspondent, in response to letters received by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA from Baltic republics: "It Is Time We Understood That We Have To Live Together"—date, place of interview not stated; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA receives a good many letters from the Baltic region. The editorial office showed the latest mail to Moscow writer Platon Afanasyev.

The choice was not accidental. Platon Sokratovich was born in Estonia, lived through the German occupation there, and lived in the republic for a long time after the war. He is fluent in Estonian and Finnish.

The letters he read contain various views on the situation in Estonia. But how does the writer himself assess it? Our correspondent discussed this with him.

[Afanasyev] The diversity of views on the political situation in the republic that KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's mail contains today is, I believe, an entirely normal phenomenon. Especially if you take into account the present distribution of social forces in Estonia and their polarization. Some Estonian writers reproach KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. You are whipping up the situation, they say, surely you can see that in the streets everything is calm, life is normal. The Russian-speaking population say: Such storms are raging, "Such blows against Soviet power" (these lines are from an actual letter) are struck by the local newspapers! So who is right? These positions demand a detailed study.

[Correspondent] Without that, it is impossible to comment on the mail. But since the letters contain not only specific opinions, but also questions, perhaps first of all we should draw attention to these.

[Afanasyev] Agreed...

[Correspondent] Many readers associate the latest political cyclone in the republic with the "celebration" of the 50th anniversary of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and the strike by Russian-speaking labor collectives after the adoption of the new Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Law on Elections, which provides, in particular, for the introduction of a residence qualification. We will come back to that. But for the moment, let us talk about some of the slogans heard during the mass action on the 50th anniversary of the signing of the pact. Let us quote one of them: The pact is proof that the Soviet Union later annexed the Baltic republics...

[Afanasyev] ...And therefore the Soviet troops should "stop the occupation." It is no accident that I interrupted you. There are indeed many questions: Is it true that the leadership of the Estonian People's Front has put forward such demands, and why does it want that? Let us look at the facts. ESTONIAN PEOPLE'S FRONT NEWS [VESTNIK NFE] No 24. M. Lotman's article, "Soviet Troops Should Be Withdrawn From the Baltic States." I quote: "Only after the withdrawal of Soviet troops will it be possible to speak of the expediency of concluding (or not concluding) a union treaty and the holding of really free elections or a referendum." One wonders, were the latest elections (the elections of USSR people's deputies) not free in Estonia? The People's Front cannot say that. Ten of its representatives won seats in the elections...

Extremes are apparently inevitable, and that cannot but affect the atmosphere in society. What is the reaction of representatives of other nationalities to, say, the formation of citizens' committees advocating a return to the bourgeois Estonian republic? The National Independence Party is also engaged in an active struggle for influence on the masses. Its membership is growing, although the Estonian National Independence Party does not enjoy great prestige. The activity of these organizations has been condemned by the republic Communist Party Central Committee, but their existence is worrying. Characteristically, many debates take place behind the backs of the Russian-speaking population, only in the pages of Estonian-language publications. An example from the journal LOOMING ("CREATIVITY"). It cites a speech by Khayn Rebas [as transliterated] of Canada, devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Estonian republic, which offers the following formulas: Prepare your own military cadres, and "do not fear or stop the struggle" itself. This is clearly a call for direct confrontation.

[Correspondent] Let us put it like this. I am your opponent. And, as is usual in such cases, I will say that we have to talk about pluralism here.

[Afanasyev] Incidentally, Rebas' calls will meet with no support among sensible people. But even the problem of pluralism of opinion itself becomes meaningless here, since ambition is extolled and debate becomes the advertising of personal prejudices.

[Correspondent] Let us try to develop this theme on the basis of our letters. Someone who signs himself only by his first name, Vello, writes from Tallinn: "Before 1940, everyone lived equally well in Estonia—Estonians and Russians, but the Soviet occupation destroyed everything."

[Afanasyev] It is no use turning the clock back 50 years, you are still in 1989. I am no politician, in fact I am not a party member, but all the same, I will say this: In assessing the events of those years we must not forget that our own times are fundamentally different.

[Correspondent] And how were things then?

[Afanasyev] I was born to a family of Russian emigres. My grandfather left Pskov province in 1919 after refusing to take part in the White rebellion. Nor did he accept the invitation to join Yudenich's [counterrevolutionary] army, which was being formed in Estonia. We lived all the time in a charitable society's huts, the family could hardly expect more. I have nothing but good to say about our Estonian neighbors.

...But my mother's brothers, when they grew up, had to change their names to Estonian names in order to find a job.

Another picture from my childhood. The famous Soviet icebreaker "Krasin" came into the port of Tallinn. Estonian workers went to the quayside carrying red flags—it was not far from our home. I saw the police breaking up that demonstration.

[Correspondent] So are we coming to the year 1940 now?

[Afanasyev] For a long time we used to paint it all in one color. Now we use a different color—black. As for the Soviet-German nonaggression pact, a commission of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies is working on this. Everyone will soon learn its conclusions. Is there any point in preempting these conclusions? But I think a detailed analysis of that period should have been carried out long ago.

Two years ago, also on 23 August, there was a rally to mark the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. That year I was working in Tallinn all summer on the manuscript of "Greater Novgorod and the Finns, 10th-12th Centuries." In the evenings, listening to the radio, I noticed that the VOICE OF AMERICA, the BBC, and other Western radio stations broadcasting in Estonian and Russian were giving detailed commentaries on the "forthcoming event." They even announced the side of the demonstration. I went there and listened carefully to the speakers. And when those present struck up the refrain from the bourgeois Estonian army's song (it formed the basis of the march of the SS "Estonia" division), I decided to speak... I said that you cannot equate totally different concepts: Fighting on the side of fascism does not mean fighting for the Estonian people's freedom.

No one doubts now that when the Red Army entered the republic under the Soviet-Estonian treaty, the subunits of the "Defense League"—there was a paramilitary organization of that name—welcomed our fighters, from the border to Tallinn.

[Correspondent] It is clear from the mail that we cannot ignore the subject of the deportations from Estonia after the restoration of Soviet power.

[Afanasyev] And now—cases like this have already occurred—even some fascist stooges are demanding rehabilitation. They say they too suffered at Stalin's hands... Everything must be investigated in detail, the archives must be brought out and published. In Estonia itself, incidentally, people of various nationalities suffered.

I remember how about 10 days before the war started there were three trains standing at the goods station in Tallinn, full of deportees who had taken part in the White movement and their families; they had taken refuge in Estonia after the Civil War. We went to see them off... Yet back in the mid-twenties the Soviet Government had declared an amnesty for participants in the White movement.

In 1949 the repressions started again. The fact that a considerable number of peasant farmers were classified as kulaks had long-lasting repercussions.

[Correspondent] It is time to move on to the heaviest package of letters, so to speak. They came after reports that monuments to the members of the Abwehr group "Erna" and Estonian SS men had been unveiled in the republic.

[Afanasyev] Personally, I support the legitimate indignation of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's readers. I say it again.

In its issue No 3 this year, the journal VIKERKAAR (RAINBOW) published an article by M. Laar on Estonian soldiers in the German Army. As was noted in connection with this item at the 15th Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, you cannot equate Germany and the Soviet Union in the war. Yet they do equate them—that too really happens.

Yes, the war scattered people on different sides of the front line. Laar, however, wants to depict the SS men as being part of the general run of "hostilities." But the truth is that the blood of civilians is on their hands.

Something else should not be forgotten. The Hitlerites' accomplices, after sitting it out in the camps, were eventually given an amnesty. Our state took a humanitarian step.

We must look at 1941 again. At that time many Estonian young people joined the Soviet hunter battalions. Anyone who did not manage to get away with the Red Army could expect to be shot. Virtually no one survived. The underground, which was formed even before the occupation, was betrayed by the then secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee, K. Syare.

[Correspondent] But the underground operated, all the same...

[Afanasyev] The "Third International" group, for instance, to which my mother belonged, had to learn the fundamentals of secret work and combat activity actually in the course of the struggle. I, as a small boy, played the part of a messenger. To this day I remember my mother's dedication... This is the subject of the poem "Memory's Film of a Wartime Childhood," which I wrote a few years ago.

[Correspondent] Let us go on to the present day. There are various assessments of the political situation in Estonia. Reader V. Kotlyarovskiy from Novosibirsk, for instance, is perplexed: "The same events in the Baltic republics keep being interpreted in different ways. Some newspapers describe them as a manifestation of perestroyka processes, others criticize them... What is the truth of it?"

[Afanasyev] Perestroyka... with all its difficulties, naturally. Only we failed to predict that scum would rise on the crest of the wave of renewal. But now national problems, sometimes artificially whipped up, could substantially influence the course of perestroyka. Estonia is, I think, no exception. From the "singing revolution" (as they called the events of 1988 in connection with the formation and strengthening of the People's Front), the republic has moved on to today's... civil war. Yes, do not be surprised, that is how the situation is described by poet Ya. Kaplinskiy in the Tartu newspaper EDAZI. His reflections are entitled "Civil War and Us."

[Correspondent] If I am not mistaken, he was the author of the statement on the need to send the "immigrants" back home?

[Afanasyev] I think his views have now changed in some respects. That is clear from his latest article. But he still explains his personal understanding of what is happening, especially since the strike at Russian-speaking enterprises, thus: A cold war is under way between innovators and conservatives, and "the first battle in this war took place in Estonia."

As world experience shows, tranquillity in interethnic relations is achieved primarily through mutual concessions and compromise. Until recently the nonindigenous population in Estonia was forced to experience discomfort, so to speak, in connection with a number of decisions at republican level. Especially after the imposition of the residence qualification in the election law.

And one last thing. According to Kaplinskiy, "civil war" is possible only if we all fail to understand that we have to live together.

[Correspondent] Let us try to sum up. It seems to me that your views could be expressed in these words: National relations become sensitive when they are based on injustices.

[Afanasyev] I would agree. But I have already said enough.

The free exchange of opinions should be the norm. Then there will be progress. True, many Estonian writers of my acquaintance, who set out together with me in this field, now try to describe me as "Moscow writer Platon Afanasyev." So formally... as if they do not want to recognize our former good relations. We will not achieve anything that way except estrangement.

Vorkuta Miners Association Resumes Strike

PM2310155589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondents Aleksandr Tretyakov and Viktor Filippov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Warning by Vorkuta Miners"]

[Text] Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic—No sooner had the polar region mines started to overcome the economic strain caused by the July strikes when a new conflict flared up. Following a decision by the city conference of workers (strike) committees, coal shipments from the "Khalmer-Yu" Mine were suspended as of 19 October, while the strike will be resumed by the remaining 12 mines of the "Vorkutaugol" Association as of 0000 on 25 October. What has caused the miners' dissatisfaction this time?

"The progress in implementing USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No 608, dated 3 August, 'On Measures To Ensure the Fulfillment of Joint Decisions Made by Government Commissions With the Participation of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and Strike Committees of Working People from the Country's Polar Regions,'" V. Gobrusev, chairman of Vorkuta City workers (strike) committee, explained the situation. "For example, we demanded the repeal of the procedure—which runs counter to common sense—whereby people lost the Northern supplements when transferring from one mine to another. We received notification: The demand has been met, supplements can be paid at the new job, but only at the discretion of the administration and the labor collective council. Why this evasion, which leaves the bosses in a position to hurt someone they find unsuitable? Decisions with identical 'loopholes' to the bureaucrats' advantages are also being made with respect to many other demands by the miners."

"But is it sensible to strive for your rights by ruining the economy?"

"What else can we do if the local organs of power are powerless to demand rigorous observance of working people's interests by the central departments?"

...A telegram announcing the decision to begin the strike has been sent from Vorkuta to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the country's coal fields. USSR People's Deputies V. Lushnikov and V. Maksimov and Deputy Minister of the Coal Industry A. Belikov arrived in this polar city last Saturday. They brought documents about the clause-by-clause fulfillment of USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No 608. They are touring the mines, briefing the workers. If only all this had been done earlier!..

Coalminers Strike in Kemerovo Oblast

LD2310160389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Mezhdurechensk (Kemerovo oblast), 23 Oct (TASS)—At the beginning of this morning's shift, from 0800 to 1000 local time, miners of collieries and opencast mines of the town of Mezhdurechensk, and also workers of transport enterprises, including railwaymen, and of the large panel housebuilding works, held a strike. According to preliminary figures, 15-20,000 people took part in it. The decision to halt production was made by the town's workers' committee several days ago. It said the reason is that a number of points of the protocol of measures agreed on after the July strike with the government commission are not being fulfilled.

Further on Mezhdurechensk Strike

LD2310180989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Mezhdurechensk (Kemerovo oblast), 23 Oct, (TASS)—At the start of today's morning shift between 0800 and 1000 local time, the miners of the mines and opencast mines of the town of Mezhdurechensk along with workers of the transport enterprises including railway workers and those of the large-panel house construction works, held a strike. Preliminary figures state that 15,000-20,000 people participated.

The town's workers committee made the decision to stop production several days ago, giving as their reasons the fact that a number of points in the protocol of measures ageed with a government commission following a strike in July were not being complied with. Yesterday, however, A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of the Kemerovo Oblast Party Committee, speaking on television and suggesting that the workers show reason, said that compliance with the Kuzbass miners' demands is proceeding apace in the government. Some 381 points have already been met although the deadine for implementing a mere three points was only 1 October.

The inexpedience of the fresh strike was discussed the day before also at the meeting between the leaders of Kemerovo oblast, the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, the Mezhdurechensk workers' committee, and the party-economic aktiv of the city. It was stressed here that to ignore the recently adopted legislative documents on solving labor disputes and conflicts means showing disrespect to people's power, the supreme body of the country and to undermine the authority of the workers movement.

Nevertheless, the action of the miners did take place.

"The strike had a warning character. It will not be reflected in the results of the work of labor collectives," considers the driver of a rock-removing machine from Shevyakov pit, deputy chairman of the Mezhdurechensk city workers' committee Yu.I.Shikharev. "The lost output will be made up for without delay: This is the decision of the workers' committee. I should note that the final choice—whether to hold the strike or not—was made by the works collectives themselves. But I think we had a right to it because our demands are not being implemented. And this is why meetings took place at the enterprises today. If we are to sum up their results, then the following can be singled out: Firstly, people consider it necessary that a competent commission which would objectively inspect the progress in the fulfillment of the protocol should arrive in Mezhdurechensk. Secondly, the working people are seriously concerned with the transfer of the enterprises to full independence. After all, the calculated coal price is to this day unknown to the miners, although it was fixed at the enterprises and submitted to the higher bodies. Incidentally, we were supported in Andzhero-Sudzhensk, other mining town of Kuzbass."

"There has been no strike in our town," said Yu.S. Lutoshkin, second secretary of the Anzhero-Sudzhensk Town Party Committee, in answer to the telephone call. "Meetings are taking place but production has not stopped. The people at the meetings, like those in Mezhdurechensk, are expressing their dissatisfaction with the course of complying with the protocol on the part of the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry. They want a government commission chaired by N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to come to the town once again. There have been some attempts to insinuate the idea of abolishing Article Six of the USSR Constitution [on the leading role of the party]. Those taking part in the meetings are drafting a letter to the government. In general, work is as normal at the enterprises. The town's life proceeds as usual."

Explosion Delays Pipeline Operation

LD2210181489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Oct 89

[From tne "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Reconstruction of the notorious Western Siberia-Urals-Volga Valley oil-product pipeline is continuing. Particular demands are being made on the quality of the reconstruction work. A few days ago there was an explosion of great force in North Tobolsk during tests on the oil-product pipeline. Our Tyumen correspondent informs us of the details.

[I. Tratsevskiy] No doubt the explosion near Ufa was far stronger, but what happened near Tobolsk is no less astonishing, though this time the pipe contained merely water. Don't be surprised, just ordinary water: it was being used to test the pipeline under pressure of approximately 70 atmospheres. So what happened was that heavy vapor products which were still in the pipe also rushed out in a burst. Even what was left of those was sufficient. As the vapors ignited, there was a massive explosion. It was just as though a meteorite had fallen in the taiga. If there had been a village nearby there would be no stoves, let alone houses left. This explosion is another sign of misfortune. Now the local soviets of Tobolsk Oblast have been forced urgently to undertake the resettlement of thousands of people out of the danger zone along the oil-product pipeline. It seems to be that this does not solve the problem of security. The more thoroughly the emergency team works the more cases of faults made by construction workers during the laying of the pipeline are discovered by them.

Specialists of the administration of oil pipelines of Western Siberia believe that it is unrealistic to put the oil pipeline into operation in 2 months time, by the new year, as envisioned previously by the government.

[V.N. Chepurkskiy, chief engineer of the administration of oil pipelines, identified by caption] We believe that to put the pipeline into a normal state we need at least 2 years. Unless we carry out a whole range of work toward bringing the pipeline from Tobolsk to Minnibayevo into line with existing demands and norms, then we will, as before, be subjecting those people who live along the route of the pipeline to danger. We have various alternative uses for this pipeline. One such alternative is to use this pipeline to transport gas. Thus we would fulfill our government's program for supplying gas to villages and settlements in the region through which this route passes. Another alternative is to use this pipeline to transport crude oil. In any case, we must resolve this matter. [video shows scorched forest, pipes, equipment, oil pipeline workers welding, men inspecting faults, interview with official]

Konarev on Railroad Holdups, Iran Border Problem

PM2310171689 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA correspondent R. Ignatyev report on interview with N. Konarev, USSR minister of railways, under the rubric "Fact and Comment": "Situation on the Railroads"—date, place of interview not stated]

[Text] At the USSR Council of Ministers session held on 20 October 1989, it was noted that the situation regarding shipments of national economic freight in the country has become an emergency. What is being done to stabilize the situation in the operation of the railroads? IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked N. Konarev, USSR minister of railways, to explain.

[Konarev] Indeed, a vast quantity of freight has accumulated on some railroads. They are not shipping out food, industrial goods, fuel... There are 176,000 containers awaiting dispatch on the main lines, and 500 trains are standing idle—that is 25,000 freightcars. As before, the railroads of the Transcaucasus are the bottleneck. The Azerbaijan railroad has virtually restored train traffic, but Armenia is not coping with the increased flow of freight arriving via the neighboring republic. Instead of the norm of 2,000 freightcars, the Yerevan section is unloading 1,500-1,600 in 24 hours. There are 38 trains standing idle on the Azerbaijan railroad, and 53 on the North Caucasus railroad. In all, 21,300 cars carrying freight for Armenia are held up on the country's railroads.

I wish to note that in general, all freight is now being allowed through the Azerbaijan railroad. But there is still a problem with the transportation of petroleum products to Stepanakert. On 22 October four gasoline tankers arrived at that station, but many more are needed.

A grave situation is also developing with transit freight traveling through our country to Iran. It arrives from all the Soviet ports and comes onto the Azerbaijan railroad. (It consists mainly of grain.) However, the trains are held up at the border station of Dzhulfa. The reason is that Iran is not quick enough to process them. Today there are more than 1,000 freightcards standing at the border carrying freight for Iran. On 23 October I met with N.H. Nobari, Iranian ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, and discussed the problem with him.

Nor are the railroads coping with the transportation of freight arriving in our country from abroad. Imported goods are stockpiled at ports and stations. Yet people are waiting for them...

In connection with the emergency situation, the Ministry of Railways collegium has adopted urgent measures. Deputy ministers and senior officials of the USSR Ministry of Railways have been sent out to several regions. But we cannot cope alone. We need the help of all interested ministries and departments.

We need to reach the plan indictors immediately, and even exceed them. Things have begun to move in the last few days. Of the 700 delayed trains, 200 have already been moved. The situation has improved at the Black Sea ports—Odessa, Ilichevsk, Novorossiysk, and others. The situation is being stabilized in Leningrad, Riga, Kaliningrad, and Vladivostok. In 2 or 3 days we hope to halve the number of delayed freightcars arriving in the USSR from socialist countries. I think this problem will have been solved by the end of the month.

On the country's railroad network as a whole, on 22 October alone the level of transfer of freight traffic between railroads increased by 15,000 freightcars. And we will increase this pace every day. [Konarev ends]

The minister believes the main problem in today's situation to be the pace of unloading freightcars. Incidentally, when N.I. Ryzhkov asked him at the government session what is being done to improve the operation of railroad transport for the winter, N.S. Konarev replied: "The way we unload will determine the way we overwinter."

The state of affairs on the country's railraods was also spoken of at a press conference held at the USSR Ministry of Railways on 23 October. It was conducted by G. Fadeyev, USSR first deputy minister of railways.

Ministry on Goods Accumulation at Border Points

LD2010203289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1136 GMT 20 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Oct (TASS)—The USSR Ministry of Railways Collegium has defined specific measures for ensuring the removal of imported cargos from sea ports and border stations. As was noted at a session which took place here on Thursday [19 Oct], (?millions) of tonnes of grain, 500,000 tonnes of sugar, 950,000 tonnes of pipes and ferrous metals, and 2 and ½ million tonnes of other imports must be removed in the shortest possible time.

At the present time there are 12,990 railway cars awaiting transfer on approaches along the border. At border stations 9,180 railway cars stand idle, awaiting reloading while more than 2.2 million tonnes of imported goods have accumulated in ports.

The collegium noted that the basic reasons for this are, in particular, the lack of rolling stock at reloading points and ports and a lack of manpower. It was decided to allocate hard currency for the purchase of foreign loading and unloading equipment.

RSFSR People's Front Formed

PM2410124589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by Mikhail Ovcharov: "RSFSR People's Front Created"]

[Text] Yaroslavl—The constituent congress at which the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Front was formed ended its work last Sunday at about midnight in Yaroslavl. According to its founders' design this is a confederation of mass sociopolitical organizations uniting the republic's democratic movements for the renewal of Soviet society on the platform of democratic socialism.

By a majority of votes the congress delegates defined the main tasks of the RSFSR People's Front: promoting the transfer of all power to the democratically elected soviets, struggling for the renunciation of violence and national, religious, and political intolerance, promoting the implementation of the principles of the rule-of-law state, and seeking balance in the economy's development on the basis of the principles of its diversity and economic independence.

The unusually motley composition of organizations and movements represented at the congress by 120 delegates with the right to a deciding vote was obvious. There were not only regional national fronts but also, for instance, Moscow's "Communists for perestroyka" club, the "Slavs" political club, the Moscow "People's Patriotic Front," the "Christian Patriotic Alliance," the Moscow "group of Orthodox christian patriots for the canonization of the tsar's family and all Russian latter-day martyrs...."

It is not surprising that the discussion at the congress was sometimes simply bitter. At some moments the congress was on the verge of splitting up, but it refrained from this. Perhaps thanks to the vigorous work of the presidium's cochairmen—USSR People's Deputies S. Belozertsev, A. Obolenskiy, and I. Shamshev.

The congress elected the working organs of the RSFSR People's Front—the coordination council headed by five cochairmen and the control and auditing commission. The delegates adopted a whole package of resolutions. In particular on elections to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the local organs of power, on its attitude toward the CPSU, on the ecology, on the status of the Russian Orthodox Church, on the status of invalids, and on the interregional group of USSR people's deputies.

More on 13 Oct RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session

PM1710151789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Unnamed TASS correspondent report under the rubric "In the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium": "Results Summed Up"]

[Text] The results of the national discussion of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] draft laws were summed up 13 October at the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium sitting. The changes and amendments to the Constitution, and the elections of RSFSR people's deputies and local soviets were discussed.

V.I. Khubiyev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Legislative Proposals Commission, delivered the report. It was noted that for 1 and ½ months there was a thoughtful discussion in the soviets, in labor collectives, public organizations, and among citizens about the democratization processes, improving the electoral system, and the rebirth of the soviets' sovereignty. The mass media took an active part in the discussion. There were more than 164,000 responses, containing specific proposals and remarks.

It was stressed that an analysis of the material received testifies to the profound interest in solving correctly questions of organizing central republic and local power, in the regeneration of the soviets as conceived by Lenin, and in forming a socialist rule-of-law state. Numerous responses state that the draft laws take into account the perestroyka processes in the country, the peculiarities of the RSFSR's national-state structure, and the experience of organizing and holding elections of USSR people's deputies.

The proposals to form a two-chamber system in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, expand the republic's range of competence, and raise autonomous formations' legal status were unanimously supported by citizens, labor collectives, and public organizations.

The rejection of elections of people's deputies directly by public organizations, and the refusal to hold okrug election meetings were interpreted positively.

At the same time, critical remarks, constructive opinions directed at deepening the democratic transformations, and objections to individual provisions in the draft law were expressed. Many responses and appeals contain specific proposals concerning the powers of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies, the republic's Supreme Soviet, and its Presidium, and of autonomous oblast and okrug soviets, the formation of organs of state power, electoral commissions' work, and summing up voting.

The legislative proposals' commission, having enlisted the help of scientists, specialists, and practical workers carefully examined all the responses, remarks, and requests received concerning the draft laws, and also the proposals made by working groups and found it possible to take some of them into account. Amendments have been made to 110 articles of the draft laws.

The discussion of the commission's proposals at the Presidium's sitting proceeded in an animated fashion, and opinions and approaches were compared. In particular, the question of national representation in the republic's corps of deputies particularly provoked discussion. This is a delicate question. One can understand the person who, rooting for the indigenous nationality of a national-territorial formation, insists that its representation is enshrined in legislation. But likewise it is difficult not to agree also with another viewpoint expressed. And it is this: Representation must be from among the population of a given territory, rather than according to nationality. Otherwise citizens' electoral rights will be limited by a framework of nationality or residence qualification once again. The okrug's electors themselves must decide whom they should delegate. And during the electoral campaign no one is forbidden to campaign for a representative of an indigenous nationality.

The presidium took into consideration the report made by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Legislative Proposals' Commission about the results of the discussion—by the people—of the RSFSR draft laws on the changes and amendments to the Constitution, the elections of RSFSR people's deputies and local soviets and agreed with the commission's proposals to introduce amendments and additions to the draft laws mentioned, taking into consideration the discussion by the people.

Certain other questions of the republic's state life were examined at the sitting.

V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, presided over the sitting.

Problems of Criminal Investigation Aired

90UN0108A Moscow TRUD in Russian
18 Oct 89 p 4

[Article by V. Belykh: "Struggle Goes On"]

[Text] A briefing yesterday at the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] was devoted to the work of the investigative apparatus.

Over the last 2 months, the number of unfilled vacancies for investigators has declined by 27 percent. Special training is offered to those assigned to investigate cases associated with organized crime.

Among the cases completed in August and September are criminal cases involving the theft of alcohol worth R1.7 million at plants in Azerbaijan and an attempt to sell it in Dagestan, the theft of products worth more than R50,000 at the Kirovabad Meat-Packing Combine and at the animal farms of Dagestan, the theft of fabric worth about R700,000 at the Kachret Garments Factory....

Groups of extortionists, robbers, and thieves have been eliminated recently in Moscow, Kalinin, Ulyanovsk, and Tula. The Investigations Administration of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] MVD is completing the investigation of a criminal case involving charges against burglars who have committed 250 crimes in five union republics. The Investigations Administration of the Belorussian SSR MVD is filing criminal charges against individuals who have produced counterfeit U.S. dollars.

While apprehending tank cars with stolen alcohol and cognac en route to Armenia and Saratov Oblast, the employees of law enforcement organs have encountered armed guards for the first time.

A total of 1,365,158 criminal cases were handled by MVD investigators over 8 months, or one-half more than in the similar period of last year.

In the first half of the year, 22,000 crimes of past years were solved in cases completed by MVD investigators. Criminal charges were filed against about 105,000 thieves, over 30,000 robbers, 3,800 speculators, 8,000 pilferers of socialist property, and in cases involving minors, which by law fall within the scope of responsibilities of the MVD, against 475 murderers and 3,400 rapists.

Basically all of this work was done with the same resources because a small number of extra positions had yet to be filled. In addition, many investigators from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukraine, and Belorussia were detailed to investigate crimes committed in conjunction with the aggravation of interethnic relations in the republics of Transcaucasia and Central Asia.

Excessive workloads of the MVD investigators were an unfavorable influence on their work. In the course of 8 months, 483,000 criminal cases were suspended because of the failure to determine the perpetrators of the crimes; 17,000 cases were referred for additional investigations. Residual cases not investigated amounted to about 300,000.

Goskomstat Chairman Gives Economic Figures

LD2010211189 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1845 GMT 19 Oct 89

[Report on remarks by V.N. Kirichenko, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics; from the "Topical Interview" feature]

[Summary] During the first 9 months of the year consumer goods production increased by almost R15 billion; however, that was R15 billion behind the target for the period. Food production grew by 3.2 percent, but deliveries to retail outlets increased by only 1 percent. There are "some good indications" on sugar beets and groats, but "very serious disruptions" with potatoes and vegetables.

There was an "uncontrollable" growth of 12.2 percent in the population's income over the 9 month period. By comparison, retail goods turnover grew by 9.9 percent, the volume of chargeable services by 8.2 percent and the production of consumer goods, including alcoholic drinks, by 7.8 percent. These figures indicate money values; taking inflation into account and discounting growth in alcohol sales, the volume of goods actually made available to the population increased by only 4 percent. Kirichenko stressed that unless "harsh and unpopular" measures are taken "we shall be unable to cope with the situation," income growth must be brought under control to prevent further disequilibrium in the market.

In the 9-month period, 840,000 apartments were commissioned. This, however, was 6 percent less than for the same period last year. There were decreases in the commissioning of other premises, too: 23 percent for schools, 19 percent for pre-school establishments, 13 percent for hospitals and 9 percent for polyclinics. This is largely due to the attitudes of local authorities. In places such as Kazakhstan, where construction of facilities is the center of attention, the results are "considerably better."

Economic Development Viewed

LD2010184889 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 20 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS—The Soviet economy has had to force its way through complications and contradictions in 1989, said Nikolay Belov, first deputy chairman of the State Statistics Committee (Goskomstat).

He was commenting on the Soviet Union's social and economic development over the first nine months of this year at a news conference here today.

Belov noted that elements of the new economic management mechanism have been introduced on an expanding scale to give the economy a more pronounced social orientation. Thus, the output of consumer goods grew four times as fast as the production of the means of production over the same period.

However, the socio-economic situation in the country has deteriorated in a number of ways.

Negative tendencies were notably on an increase from July to September, caused mostly by the weakening of production discipline, inter-ethnic conflicts and strikes.

During the past nine months, an average of 34,000 workers failed to report to their jobs every day. In September, the number reached nearly 100,000. This deprived the country of more than 700 million roubles worth of products.

As a result, the overall rate of economic growth declined considerably. The national income grew a bare 2.4 percent in the nine months of 1989, as against 4.7 percent over the same period of last year.

Monetary incomes increased while the supplies of consumer goods lagged. The issue of banknotes went up by 17.3 percent.

At the same time, demands was left unsatisfied for foodstuffs and consumer goods worth 90 billion roubles, which amounts to one quarter of the commodity turnover.

Belov said that the average consumer goods price index went up by 2.6 percent. The rate of housing, social and cultural construction dropped. Crime increased by 30 percent.

Speaking about Soviet foreign economic activity, Belov pointed out that the country's foreign trade turnover rose by 2.8 percent as compared with the first nine months of 1988.

As of October 1, 1989, 936 joint ventures, involving firms and organisations of 53 countries, were registered in the Soviet Union.

However, the country's foreign debt amounted to 34 billion foreign currency roubles on July 1 this year and is likely to reach 40 billion roubles by the end of 1989.

That amount includes debts payable in convertible currencies, CMEA transferrable roubles and other kinds of currency.

Assessing prospects of the 1989 grain yield, Belov said that the expected gross grain yield will amount to between 208 and 209 million tonnes, as against 195 million tonnes last year.

Amendments to USSR Law on Cooperative System

PM2010155189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

["USSR Law on Amendments and Additions to USSR Law 'On the Cooperative System in the USSR'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

To make the following amendments and additions to the 26 May 1988 USSR Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR" (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1988, No 22, p 355):

1. In Article 19:

The following paragraph is to be added to Point 2:

"With a view to ensuring price stability on the consumer market soviets of people's deputies may set upper limits for prices (tariffs) for basic consumer goods (services) produced and sold by cooperatives, including cooperatives in the consumer cooperative system";

The first provision of Point 4 is to read:

"4. State monitoring of prices (tariffs) is carried out in cases where the output (work, services) of a cooperative is sold to enterprises and organizations under contract to fulfill the state order or is manufactured from raw or semifinished materials supplied to the cooperative from state resources, where a cooperative sells goods allocated from state market stocks or acquired by it from the retail trade network, and also where cooperatives sell goods (services) for which upper limits have been set for prices (tariffs)."

2. The following provision is to be added to Paragraph 2 of Point 3, Article 28:

"Cooperatives acquiring goods by means of imports sell these goods to the population at prices no higher than the level of prices laid down for similar goods by the corresponding state organs."

3. The following paragraph is to be added to Point 2, Article 40, after Paragraph 3:

"Leadership workers from state management organs and also from state, public, or cooperative enterprises, organizations, and institutions whose functions include the monitoring of the activity of cooperatives, including workers from the relevant services of the said organizations, are not permitted to become members of cooperatives in the sphere of production and services or to work for them under a labor contract."

M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Moscow, Kremlin, 16 October 1989

Government Discusses Draft Pension Law 13 Oct

PM1810105689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Pension Reform in Preparation"]

[Text] A session of the USSR Council of Ministers on 13 October examined the draft Law on Pension Provision for Citizens in the USSR, drawn up in accordance with the decisions of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The government noted the particular significance of the measures outlined for substantially improving material provision for pensioners as the section of the country's population that has least social protection. At present, there are nearly 60 million people who are old-age pensioners, invalids, or members of families who have lost the breadwinner.

The speakers at the session analyzed comprehensively the material position of all categories of pensioners, comparing it with the growth in wages and the population's income, changes in prices, and the working people's real standard of living. It was stressed that the pension legislation that has been in force for more than 30 years has become outdated to a great extent, the gap between average wages and pensions has increased, and the link between the pensions set and the labor contribution of workers has basically been lost. Many shortcomings have accumulated in the setting of privileged pensions in connection with difficult or harmful working conditions, and there are unjustified differences in citizens' pension provision and other shortcomings in pension legislation.

The USSR Council of Ministers acknowledged that the proposed draft law makes radical changes to the country's pension system. The basic principles on which the provisions of the draft new pension law are based are in line with the current radical economic reform in the country, the course of social transformations, and the norms of a rule-of-law state. The most important of them are the uniformity and universality of pension provision, social justice and protection for citizens, and the close link between the size of the pension and the labor contribution of each worker. It is basically a question of a major reform in this sphere.

The participants in the session examined in detail all the provisions of the draft law. The proposal to establish two pensions—labor and social pensions—met with support. Labor pensions (for age, invalidity, loss of the breadwinner, and length of service) would be set where there is a labor record. A new type of pensions, social pensions, is to be established for those people who for various reasons do not have a labor record. This will enable the pension system to cover all citizens who are not capable of work.

It was deemed expedient to preserve unchanged the age for retirement on the old-age pension, at 55 for women and 60 for men. The requirements concerning length of service also remain unchanged.

In the course of the discussion attention was drawn to the peculiarities of pension provision for various categories of the population, including women with children, war and labor invalids, and invalids since childhood.

The new mechanism for determining the size of the pension was examined in detail. Its distinguishing feature is the strengthening of the pension's dependence on length of service and wages. A systematic increase in pensions is proposed, as well as variations based on the cost of living index. Different approaches were suggested for determining the minimum and maximum pension. The proposal to establish the minimum pension at the level of the minimum wage for workers and employees met with support. Criteria for establishing the maximum pension were defined.

The question of privileged pension provision was discussed most heatedly. A departmental approach could be clearly perceived in a number of speeches. The USSR Council of Ministers did not support this position on the part of ministries, and came out in favor of regulating the system of privileged pensions on the basis of an integrated approach to types of production with harmful or difficult working conditions, irrespective of their departmental affiliation. At the same time, the special working conditions for workers in the coal and shale industry and mining construction were taken into account.

In determining the size of pension for workers employed in regions of the Far North and equivalent localities, it is proposed to calculate these pensions on the basis of wages, taking into account the regional coefficients.

Great attention was devoted to the question of the procedure for paying pensions to working pensioners. Since different views were expressed on this point, it was decided to clarify the conditions for paying them pensions.

The government supported proposals from the union republic Councils of Ministers on significantly extending the rights and powers of republics, local soviets, and labor collectives for improving material provision for pensioners out of their own resources.

It was noted in the speeches by V.I. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Questions, and S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU], that the draft law was discussed in many labor collectives of enterprises and organizations, and its basic provisions met with support.

The main source of funds for financing this major socioeconomic measure by the state in the 13th 5-Year Plan must be highly efficient work by all sectors of the national economy. The attention of union republic Councils of Ministers and all ministries and departments was particularly drawn to this.

Taking the draft law as a basis, the government instructed the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Questions, with the participation of the AUCCTU, to amend it in the light of the proposals put forward by ministries and departments, union republic Councils of Ministers, trade union organs, and individual citizens. In October of this year the USSR Council of Ministers will submit the law to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Taking part in the session were deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairmen of union republic Councils of Ministers, other members of the USSR Government, USSR people's deputies, and leaders of social organizations.

N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, conducted the session.

Leningrad United Front of Working People Meets

LD2110183989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1630 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Text] Leningrad, 21 Oct (TASS)—TASS correspondent Irina Zolotareva reports:

Some 3,000 people took part in today's conference here of the United Front of Working People [obyyedinennyy front trudyashchikhsya] of Leningrad and oblast, devoted to discussion of the Front's economic platform. This sociopolitical organization emerged in the city on the Neva 4 months ago.

The speeches by scientists, experts, and workers expressed alarm at the economic situation in the country and dissatisfaction with the progress of perestroyka. The participants in the conference sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet and local bodies of power their own proposals for solving the economic problems, in particular, on carrying out monetary reform and on the activity of state enterprises and cooperatives.

Members of the United Front of Working People fundamentally denounced the strike movement. Stressing the workers' responsibility for the destiny of socialism, they spoke in favor of strengthening the unity of society on the basis of communist ideals.

Among the guests of the conference were representatives from the Intermovement of Baltic Republics and the recently instituted United Front of Working People of Russia.

Belitskiy on Radio During Stalin, Brezhnev Era

LD2410101889 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 23 Oct 89

["Vantage Point" feature; commentary by Boris Belitskiy]

[Excerpts] Representatives from leading broadcasting organizations in many countries are coming to Moscow this week for celebrations marking the 60th anniversary of Radio Moscow. This is the subject Boris Belitskiy speaks about in Vantage Point.

[Belitskiy] With perestroyka, Radio Moscow has become compulsive listening for thousands who might never otherwise have dreamed of tuning in—those words from a London listener John Skerrit reflect the new appeal that Radio Moscow has acquired, thanks to the twin policies of perestroyka and glasnost, 60 years on from its birth in October 1929.

To be sure, it didn't always have this appeal. I still remember broadcasting in Stalin's time when we had to attribute every single achievement in the country to the genius of a single person, or in Brezhnev's time when a national leadership, infallible by definition, made it extremely difficult to question any of its policy moves, at home or abroad.

True, even then, we had a vast listening audience eager to hear the other side of the story—Moscow's version of the critical situations that kept cropping up first in one and then in another corner of the earth, and particularly in East-West relations. But I can't help thinking how much bigger and more responsive that audience would have been had we been able then to speak with the frankness, the respect for the other side's views that we now take for granted.

Today, in the welcome atmosphere of glasnost, openness, we no longer speak in a single, official voice, claiming to know all the answers to the world's problems. Radio Moscow, once a monolith in terms of opinion, has acquitted a new philosophy of expression, as is always the case wherever thinking people voice their true opinions. We rejoice that this is appreciated by our listeners. [passage ommitted]

In all the 77 languages in which we broadcast to 160 countries we seek to avoid a confrontational tone and never cultivate an enemy image—something both sides were guilty of in the years of the Cold War now, thank God, at long last over. Nor do we hesitate to speak of our problems, many of which turn out to be common to many countries. [passage omitted]

It's a source of deep satisfaction to us, and we hope to our partners too, that such cooperation has become possible, and this is one reason why our guests from broadcasting organizations in other countries will be most welcome to our anniversary celebrations this week. As you will have noted from the changes I've described we do have something to celebrate on this 60th birthday of Radio Moscow.

Article Critical of Historian Afanasyev Reprinted

LD2110162189 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 21 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 21 TASS—MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper today reprinted an article from a Noginsk paper criticising Moscow historian Yuriy Afanasyev's view of the role of the Soviet Communist Party. Afanasyev is a USSR people's deputy elected by the residents of this town near Moscow.

Forces which steer matters towards discrediting and breaking up the party as a ruling one by virtually throwing it out of the country's political life are now actively forming, the article says. Such a stand was taken up in particular by party member Yuriy Afanasiyev, a people's deputy of the USSR.

The article draws attention to Afanasyev's striving to remove the CPSU by any means, including disreditation, from administering the country.

Touching upon Afansyev's calls for a return to the capitalist way of development, the article emphasises that perestroyka, contemplated as a revolution, may degenerate into counterrevolution if it is carried out according to a Western model by forcing the people to give up the socialist way of development.

IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS No 10 Reviewed

PM2010112589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Latest Issue of IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS"]

[Text] The 10th issue of IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS has been published. It opens with a report on the work of the party's Central Committee in September 1989, the main event of which was the Central Committee plenum. The plenum adopted a decision on convening the 28th CPSU Congress, approved the party's platform on the nationalities policy, and made changes in the composition of the party's top organs.

The journal carries information about the plenum decisions and publishes a roundup of working people's letters on questions of interethnic relations, which was circulated among the plenum participants. It also publishes brief biographies of the new members and candidate members of the Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretaries.

The Central Committee Politburo resolution adopted in connection with the unsatisfactory provision of the population with essential nonfood goods and a detailed report on the discussion of this question on the instructions of the Politburo by a session of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee are published in the issue. A Central Committee Secretariat resolution which is published in the issue analyzes antiarmy sentiments in a number of the country's regions.

The journal carries reports on the latest sessions of CPSU Central Committee commissions which discussed ways of improving state purchase prices for agricultural produce and questions of the management of scientific and technical progress.

A report by the CPSU Central Auditing Commission generalizes the experience and shortcomings of work in dealing with working people's letters at central party newspaper and journal editorial offices.

The latest issue of the IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS contains a new rubric "Toward the 28th CPSU Congress." It contains the first roundup of proposals received at the party Central Committee concerning the new CPSU Statutes. They have come from party organizations and committees, labor collectives, Communists, and non-party people. A number of other articles are also devoted to preparations for the congress, for instance a report on the intraparty debate in Moscow.

The journal continues its publication of documents of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for the additional examination of materials connected with the repressions of the thirties, forties, and early fifties. On this occasion, they are devoted to the case of the so-called "Moscow counterrevolutionary organization—the "worker opposition" group. A report of the USSR Prosecutor's Office and the USSR KGB throws light on the extra-judicial organs which were operating in the country.

Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Bureau documents published in the "Information and Chronicle" section are devoted to the causes of the tragic events in Fergana Oblast and the steps being taken in this connection. There are also reports on social and consumer services available to war and labor veterans in Ulyanovsk Oblast, information and biographical data about the changes in the composition of the party's central elective organs, reports on the election of new party committee first secretaries, the ratification of party officials, a review of the party's international ties, and replies to listeners' questions.

A lot of space is devoted to the publication of documents from party archives, including the continuation of the stenographic record of the Eighth Congress of the RKP(b) [Russian Communist Party (bolsheviks)] covering, among other things, the debate on military policy questions, notes of the prominent economist P.P. Maslov on the state of the country's agriculture on the eve of collectivization, a review of IZVESTIYA TSK RKP(b) No. 7 for 1919, and archive photographs.

Editor of RODINA Journal Decribes Publication

PM1710150589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 p 1

[Unattributed interview with Yu.A. Sovtsov, chief editor of RODINA journal and member of the PRAVDA editorial collegium: "RODINA Listens, RODINA Knows...."]

[Text] [Correspondent] Yuriy Aleksandrovich, it seems the new journal RODINA, a PRAVDA publication, is better known abroad that at home. The West German newspaper DIE WELT reported: The journal RODINA... "is a hit in Moscow. Its print run of 300,000 is an instant sellout."

[Sovtsov] The point is that our journal's birth coincided with the memorable "subscription campaign" which was seen as an attempted offensive against glasnost. By force of circumstance, as it were, our entire trial print run of 300,000 copies was placed with the retail trade. Without subscribers or advertisers, we were left with casual readers. For example, they were able to buy the first issue, but the second issue was not available. Hence, the most fragmented and incomplete ideas about the journal. The fact that it is now one of the publications in really short supply does not in any way boost editorial confidence, it actually prompts sad thoughts about the rigidity of our publishing house and the inability to forecast demand. For example, the initial print run of our contemporary—IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS—was set at 600,000 copies.

[Correspondent] The journal will soon be a year old. Is anything likely to change on its coming of age?

[Sovtsov] Yes. A large proportion of the print run is already delivered to subscribers. Although I am not too sure whether it is a good thing if only half as many copies are on sale at kiosks. There is only one way out—to increase the print run. I could say that we have been lucky. We seem to be among the lucky ones being switched to new printing presses at the publishing house. This will make it possible to use better paper and, by the end of our second year (wishful thinking!), to reach 1 million readers.

[Correspondent] How would you define the journal's position? The selfsame DIE WELT considers it—rather surprisingly, in my view—"green and conservative." On the other hand, other reviewers treat you almost as left-wing radicals....

[Sovtsov] I think he truth lies somewhere in the middle. We try as far as possible to offer a platform to every side, to listen to diverse, even diametrically opposite viewpoints so as to draw from them everything interesting and constructive. The idea of national reconciliation underlies the journal's composition. We perceive a mainstay of unity in the fatherland's common history, which for many decades was written to suit subjective views and political considerations. We are known as a country with an unpredictable past. Today our past needs truthful and unprejudiced study.

It is for this purpose that we inaugurated the rubric "Our Research," based on a strictly scientific documentary approach. Judging by our mail, readers have highly appreciated the journal's attempts to investigate the causes of Sergey Mironovich Kirov's assassination and the tragedy which befell the family of Nikolay Romanov, the last tsar of Russia. Just as they appreciated the attempt to analyze the role of the working class in perestroyka, which was, incidentally, made by a young worker. Another example—the fate of the Constituent Assembly, which was the topic of a "roundtable" discussion. On the one hand, we listened to the arguments of representatives of what could be described as the traditional school; on the other hand, to those of the recently created Association of Young Historians. We were prompted to do this by the public interest in Russia's first attempt at parliamentary government which developed just before the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Why did the Assembly fail? What prevented its success? Would it not be instructive to look into all this at this moment in time?

[Correspondent] Who are the readers at whom your journal is aimed? What sort of authors is it looking for?

[Sovtsov] This is how I would answer. We are aiming at young people who seriously ponder their motherland's future. There are plans to create a "Rodina" young people's patriotic club jointly with the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League Central Committee and the TASS youth affairs editorial office; it will have its own premises for meetings with anyone who might be of interest to our readers—potential authors. Let me repeat that we do not divide them along national, class, or geographical lines. Talent is the sole criterion! We would like to "break with the center," to turn down famous names, and to free "space" for unknown current affairs writers in, say, Orel, Tashkent, or Khabarovsk who might be looking for a platform.... Has anyone ever listened to them or brought them together? I think that our journal could do this. We have already discovered a series of names, including Siberians V. Chernykh and Ye. Yepanchintsev, young authors A. Fadin, Ye. Kazhokin, D. Feldman, A. Afanasyev....

[Correspondent] So far, libraries have been the most accessible location for reading your journal. But librarians are complaining: RODINA's deliveries are delayed. What is the cause of these delays?

[Sovtsov] You know, we developed strange relations with the censorship from the time of our very first issue. We somehow found ourselves immediately in disgrace, we were treated with suspicion. Even though there is, of course, no question at all of publicizing any military or state secrets. For example—the story of Bulat Okudzhava's article about Crimean Tatars which was deleted from the issue and was the topic of subsequent argument in the party Central Committee. Which, incidentally, failed to find anything seditious in the article. Take also the journal's issue No. 7, which was "in detention" for several days. The fact that RODINA still reaches the readers is an indication of our status.... PRAVDA will manage to cool down the zealous administrators. Meanwhile, we are impatiently awaiting the promulgation of the Law on the press. Let us hope that it will dot all the "i's."

[Correspondent] And one traditional question. What does the journal's editorial portfolio have in store?

[Sovtsov] Our next few issues will carry documentary research material: The role played by freemasons on the eve of the revolution, the famine in Kazakhstan, the suppression of the "Antonov insurgency," the 1937 census or statistics of Stalin's repressions. We are planning a number of sharply polemical articles whose common topic I would describe as criticism of dogmatism in the Marxist-Leninist legacy.

We will try to fill yet another void. We will actively promote the topic of Russia pending the creation of an all-Russian sociopolitical journal. The main avenues here are regional economic accountability, the fate of small peoples, ecology, and the creation of new Russian structures.

CPSU's Manayenkov Attends Bibliophiles' Conclave

PM2310095589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Readers' Union"]

[Text] Having won the right to own books, we should also assume the important duty of learning to distinguish fine, intelligent works from superficial offerings, and to inspire respect for our native language and culture. That was how the members of the All-Union Bibliophiles Society, whose congress ended in Moscow 20 October, defined their task. The discussion was acute and contained sharp criticism of the central board and of the society's work as a whole.

Yu.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the congress' work.

A new VOK (henceforth the bibliophiles' association will be known as the All-Union Voluntary "Book" Society—VOK) Board was elected at the congress. Academician I.V. Petryanov-Sokolov was reelected chairman of the VOK Central Board at its plenum.

Economic

Gorbachev Chairs Meeting of Leading Economists

LD2310185789 Moscow TASS in English 1836 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Leading Soviet economists gathered at the party headquarters today to discuss the economic situation in the country and ways to overcome difficulties facing the national economy.

The meeting, chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev, was attended by people's deputies and heads of several central economic agencies, associations and enterprises. [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1826 GMT on 23 October carries an item on the economists' meeting which notes here that: V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, and G.I. Usmanov attended the meeting]

The economists will continue the discussions.

A report on the meeting will be published.

Council of Ministers Examines Economic Data

PM2110164189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "At the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] On 20 October the USSR Council of Ministers examined the question of the country's socioeconomic development during the first 9 months of 1989.

The session of the USSR Government held a fundamental, concrete discussion about how the task of intensifying the social reorientation of the economy, further democratizing management, and enhancing the activeness of labor collectives and the process of restructuring the national economy as a whole are proving complex and contradictory. The extent to which group egoism manifests itself to the detriment of state interests has broadened and there has been a decline in production discipline and labor discipline, which have been largely responsible for the weakening and violation of economic ties and the growing imbalance of output and monetary circulation. Difficulties in the economy have also been intensified by interethnic conflicts and strikes

The development of the national economy has slowed down as a result of this. The rate of growth in national income and industrial output during the January-September period is down by almost half in comparison with the same period last year. There was a particularly serious slump in the economy in the third quarter, when growth in output volumes virtually stopped and there was a substantial increase in failures to honor supply contracts.

During the discussion, the work of all national economic complexes and the union republics was subjected to close scrutiny. The situation in the fuel and energy, metallurgical, and chemical-timber complexes during the first 9 months was deemed unsatisfactory. There has been a considerable deterioration in the economic performance of the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry, the USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry, and also in that of the "Gazprom" concern and the "Agrokhim" and "Soyuzstroymaterialy" associations.

There has been a sharp drop in the rate of growth in industrial output in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Azerbaijan SSR, the Estonian SSR, the Georgian SSR, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], and the Lithuanian SSR.

The USSR Council of Ministers heard a report by N.S. Konarev, USSR minister of railways. The government noted with particular concern that the situation with the transportation of national economic freight in the country has now become extreme [chrezvychaynyy]. Food and industrial goods, including imported goods, have been left standing for a long time at railroad stations and sea ports. The greatest quantity of freight has accumulated on railroads in Azerbaijan and Moldavia, and also in the ports of Odessa, Novorossiysk, and Leningrad. As many as 22 of the country's 32 railroads are failing to meet targets for hauling freight.

There was a particularly pointed discussion at the government session about the state of the consumer market. The situation with regard to the population's food supplies is still tense. Union republics have failed to achieve the planned output of agricultural raw materials and foodstuffs.

Despite the fact that the agricultural harvest was greater this year, in the first 9 months the market registered a foodstuffs shortfall worth R3.7 billion. There have been large shortfalls in foodstuffs output in the Latvian SSR, the Georgian SSR, the Azerbaijan SSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Uzbek SSR, and many oblasts in the RSFSR.

The USSR fishing industry minister's attention was drawn to major shortcomings in practical activity. In the first 9 months of the year the retail trade network had a shortfall of almost 700,000 tonnes of fish products. At the same time, licences to sell more than 430,000 tonnes of fish products abroad have been issued to various organizations this year with the USSR Ministry of the Fishing Industry's knowledge. What is more, among those who have received licences are organizations which have absolutely nothing to do with either catching fish or processing it.

Serious complaints were made against the leaders of republics, ministries, and departments in connection with failure to meet the planned program for retooling processing enterprises in the agroindustrial complex. The fact that equipment imported for these purposes, at a cost of hundreds of millions of rubles, still has not been brought into operation in a number of places was seen as intolerable.

The USSR Government demanded that the union republics' councils of ministers, the USSR Council of Ministers' State Commission for Food and Purchases, the USSR Ministry of the Fishing Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Trade take urgent measures to improve the population's supply of foodstuffs.

The situation of the output of nonfood consumer goods and their supply to the trade network is changing extremely slowly. During the first 9 months there was a shortfall of these goods worth R5.6 billion across the country. Particularly large shortfalls have been noted at enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and Instrument Making, the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Defense Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry. The attention of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and the USSR Ministry of Trade was drawn to the fact that they have failed to supply a number of consumer goods from abroad in good time.

The session once again stressed that one of the main reasons for the consumer market's exacerbated situation is that growth in the population's monetary income is not commensurate with growth in production output. Whereas the volume of industrial output increased by 2.2 percent in the period January-September, the population's monetary income rose by 12.2 percent. On the spot checks have shown that this lack of correspondence is caused by the continuing rise in wages in isolation from end results and the fact that many enterprises are making unjustified profits, including by charging exorbitant prices for their products.

High wage growth without corresponding returns is also taking place in scientific organizations. During the first 9 months of the year, wages in planning and design, research, and planning and surveying organizations rose by between 26 and 42 percent. This has been particularly apparent in the USSR State Committee for Construction Affairs' [Gosstroy] system. In this connection, the USSR Council of Ministers has decided to cancel the resolution on transferring scientific organizations to full economic accountability and self-financing with regard to all scientific and planning organizations under the USSR

Gosstroy's jurisdiction. At the same time, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems have been instructed, together with ministries and departments, to instil order in the remuneration of labor in research, planning, and design organizations which have already transferred to the new principles of economic management and, when necessary, to submit relevant proposals to the government.

The USSR Council of Ministers stressed that it is still an exceptionally important task to speed up the construction of housing and other projects in the social sphere and improve their quality considerably . Union republics and a number of ministries have fallen seriously behind in this respect. As a result, the commissioning of projects in the sociocultural sphere in the period January-September of this year fell in comparison to last year by the following percentages: housing—6 percent; clinics—9 percent; hospitals—13 percent; preschool institutions—19 percent; general education schools—23 percent; and vocational and technical schools—35 percent.

The most unsatisfactory situation with regard to housing construction is to be found in the Tajik SSR, Azerbaijan SSR, Estonian SSR, Georgian SSR, and Moldavian SSR, where less than half of the year's program has been met.

The construction of schools, kindergartens, and medical institutions is particularly unsatisfactory in the Georgian SSR, Azerbaijan SSR, and Moldavian SSR.

The government also drew the attention of the leaders of USSR ministries and departments and the union republics' Councils of Ministers to the extremely uneven commissioning of production capacities, as a result of which the 1989 start-up program is in jeopardy. More than 80 percent of new projects will have to be commissioned in the last quarter of the year.

During the discussion, the participants in the session expressed great concern regarding the supply of fuel and energy to the population and the national economy. The government has instructed the Councils of Ministers of the union and autonomous republics, the executive committees of kray, oblast, rayon, and city soviets of people's deputies, and ministries and departments to promptly complete the necessary work in preparation for winter.

The USSR Council of Ministers felt it necessary to take strict disciplinary action against some leaders for major omissions in their work. V.G. Chebotarev, chief of the Volga Railroad, was released from his duties. A reprimand was issued to N.I. Kotlyar, USSR minister of the fishing industry, and a strict reprimand to his first deputy, V.M. Lushnikov. Reprimands were also issued to A.Ye. Sochilin, USSR deputy minister of the electrical equipment industry and instrument making, and A.Ya. Sidenko, USSR deputy minister of railways.

The government outlined constructive measures to improve the economy and decisively strengthen the labor and executive discipline at enterprises and in organizations of the national economy.

The deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairmen of the union republics' Councils of Ministers, other USSR Government members, and representatives of the mass media took part in the session.

N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chaired the session.

Economist Urges Curbing Wage Increases

904F0001A Moscow TRUD in Russian
29 Sep 89 P2

[Report on interview with A.V. Orlov, deputy chairman of the governmental commission on economic reform of the USSR Council of Ministers, by V. Golovachev; date and place not given]

[Text] The deputy chairman of the governmental commission for economic reform of the USSR Council of Minister, A.V. Orlov, talks about plan priorities, extraordinary measures, and limitations on the growth of wage funds.

[Golovachev] Before discussing the draft plan for 1990, I would like to understand why the economic condition of the country is getting worse. This year it became significantly more difficult than a year ago. Many readers ask if we are we going in that direction?

[Orlov] In my view, the economic situation is deteriorating because transition to new economic relations moves with great difficulties. Here, of course, mistakes can be made, but overall the direction is undoubtedly right. We must only follow it more purposefully to its realization.

To discuss the reasons for the deterioration of economic conditions in the country more concretely, the most important are the following. We determined the initial conditions of perestroyka and reform imprecisely. In fact we disposed of far fewer assets than we thought, basing ourselves on existing statistics. To tell the truth, we deceived ourselves for a long time.

For instance, we were assured by our statistics that the population requires 65 kg of meat per capita. But this figure is suspect. Taking into account horns, hooves, and many other things which are not counted in developed countries, real consumption will be significantly less. That covers many commodities.

In all, however, the true consumption portion of the national income is far smaller than we imagine. This way a false basis underlies the calculations. On this rickety foundation, projects and plans were built. This caused serious miscalculations and errors. Today they are coming out in the open. We must at last honestly tell the public where we stand. Further, the democratization of administration, aside from positive moves, has brought out definite negative aspects. Enterprises going over to economic independence, which by itself is right, in many cases naturally went out from under the control of ministries. This not only strengthened the creative activity of people, but, strangely, gave rise to dependence, to group interests. One comes across a decline in labor and organizational discipline, a tendency to reduce plans and amounts of production, and a tendency to improve the financial success of enterprises by raising prices. Many direct cooperative connections were interrupted.... Why did it happen? It is not too hard to understand: We are dismantling administrative methods and the economic ones are just barely beginning to function. They do not run with full force, partly because the essential deep foundation in the form of reconstructed property relationships has not been created.

Look, the market is not developed; there is a strangulation taking on ugly forms. Prices are disorderly and not adjusted to market conditions. Currency circulation is significantly disordered; inflation has taken on dangerous forms.... Add to it strikes and interethnic conflicts, which cost the country very much.

[Golovachev] Why did we, as it is said, enter the water without knowing where the ford is and begin an economic reform not having prepared for appropriate conditions?

[Orlov] How can you create a normal consumption market, not having created the means of production? To completely escape a transitional period is impossible. But who could have predicted such an intensification of interethnic relations and explosion of strikes? Who could have foreseen that the social conscience would have been insufficiently prepared for self-government and to take on new economic relationships?

At this point I would like to remind you of a very important thought of Lenin about the necessity of a sharp rise in the level of culture in the broadest sense of the word. It is an absolutely necessary condition in the normal development of society, and from this our relationship to reform in many respects is being formed.

[Golovachev] And if this very hour everything would turn back several years, how would you begin—otherwise?

[Orlov] Naturally, from the vantage point of the last years everything is more visible. We should begin, I think, from agriculture and trade, do many things differently....

[Golovachev] What are the main ways out of the crisis?

[Orlov] Here a complex of measures is indicated. First of all, the normalization of the consumption market. It is planned to increase the volume of services by 11.1 percent, and turnover of goods by R40 billion. But this is possible only on condition that all planned production of goods and services will be attained. But in the meantime, as shown in practice and in developments on the wholesale goods market, events in this field call for great concern.

At what cost is it proposed to increase the goods turnover? A break in the growing output of television sets, washing machines, and other goods, conversion, moving to the consumption market of released construction materials, speeding up of the modernization of light industry, increasing the power of agricultural raw material processing machinery, and imports.

Second, improvement of financial health. Reduction of centralized capital contributions by R23.4 billion, reduction by R12 billion of defense expenditures, substantial, (R16 billion) growth in imposition of taxes on turnover in communications, and sharp increases in the production and sales of goods, and other measures. In all, for the first time in the last 2 decades the income growth of the government budget will be faster than the growth of expenditures. True, we will not succeed in liquidating the deficit, but we intend to reduce it by about a half, down to R60 billion. Likewise it is intended to reduce the currency issue by about half. The most important, I repeat, is to achieve breaking the negative trends.

[Golovachev] Among the extraordinary measures to improve the health of the economy is a limitation on the growth of income. This has brought out great dissatisfaction in many labor unions. TRUD contained items on this theme. Heated discussions flared up at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. What would be your comment on this question?

[Orlov] I believe this is precisely a case calling for cold-blooded reasoning. The measure taken is understandably unpopular. But this, I emphasize, is an extraordinary measure forced by circumstances, and is temporary—calculated to run for 15 months.

I want especially to focus your attention on the fact that this question was carefully examined in the government. Just recently, on 21 September, the USSR Council of Ministers adopted the resolution "on the order and tax relief pertaining to tax regulation of the fund for labor compensation at governmental enterprises (associations)."

First of all I shall remind you that the tax is not collected on production of consumer goods. This is important in principle. Now about relief. The increase in the means applied to increases in volumes of production in the fields of plant agriculture and animal husbandry is free from taxation.

Further, the tax is not levied in cases where growth of means is occasioned by the growth of amounts of work in construction and major rebuilding of residential buildings and objects of social-cultural significance.

Finally, one more instance of relief which strengthens the principle of social justice. Relief payments to families of those who perished at work, monetary compensation in excess of established pensions, and payments to persons permanently retired due to disability or work-related illness are exempt from tax. This means that if money from the wage funds go, for instance, for supplemental payments to factory pensioners, these moneys are not taxed. This tax is not levied on means of payment to invalids and persons of limited capacity for work. A series of other tax-relief measures is foreseen.

[Golovachev] Many letters to the editor are received on how to calculate the amount of the tax. People complain about the vague formulation and logic of the resolution of the Supreme Soviet which can mean many things when it comes to taxing the wage fund.

[Orlov] First I shall emphasize that the tax is levied only on the growth of means for paying labor. Now let us examine a concrete example.

Let us say that the base wage fund is R1 million. It grew 6 percent for the quarter, i.e. by R60,000. The order of calculation of the tax levy follows. Of the growth, 3 percent or 30,000 of our 60,000 are not taxed.

Then we go into the next 20,000 (growth of 3 to 5 percent). Here for every ruble of growth one must give up 1 ruble of tax. Which means that for 20,000 of growth there will be 20,000 of tax. This means there will be no raise, no loss.

Finally, the last 10,000 of the 60,000 of growth. As we see, that is growth over 5 percent. Here, in accordance with the scale, there is more severe accounting: For every ruble of growth 2 rubles are given back.

This way, the total sum of the tax will be R40,000, and of the growth, the collective will keep R20,000.

[Golovachev] Is this fair? A simple calculation will show it: If the growth of the fund is 7.5 percent, then the entire growth goes for tax. If the growth is over 7.5 percent, then the assets of the base fund must be applied....

[Orlov] Under present emergency conditions it will become necessary to coordinate every step of one's development with growth in wage costs every 15 months. This applies to enterprises as well as the country as a whole.

[Golovachev] How will it be with those enterprises for which it had already been planned for them that the fourth quarter will show an increase in the volume of production with a corresponding growth in wages? They may lack the means to pay for labor even at zero tax rate. The result may be that workers worked more for less pay....

[Orlov] Each such case must be studied individually. We absolutely must do further calculations, consult with administrators and economists of the large enterprises, look for optimal variants. Life does not stand in place....

[Golovachev] In conclusion, I would like to ask about yet another aspect. If we were to freeze pay and leave prices alone, then constantly growing inflation will bring on a lowering of the standards of living. But in the draft plan it is intended to raise real incomes by 5.8 percent. At the cost of what?

[Orlov] Indeed. Under such conditions it is essential to place a barrier before the growth of prices. But I shall note that between prices and incomes there are narrow relationships. Regulating one, one must regulate the other. That is in the plan for 1990. Specialists are now working on concrete mechanisms for price restraint and on concrete anti-inflationary measures. When proposals will be ready, they may be announced.

I would like to refine another concept: A "freeze" on pay, as you called it, in our case does not mean that it will not grow. Pay rates surely will increase. Thus, money income, according to calculations, will grow by 9 percent in 1990.

I would like to emphasize: These are all calculations and plans, which are now under active consideration in commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Economic Methods of Quality Control Urged

904A0027A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 p 1

[Report of interview with V.V. Sychev, chairman of USSR Gosstandart, doctor of technical sciences, professor, by A. Semenov: "Quality in the Presence of Deficit"]

[Text] The all-union competition for the best concept of quality control declared by the USSR Gosstandart [State Committee for Standards] evoked an immense amount of interest among our readers. Everyone is given the opportunity to make his contribution to the creation of the national program "Quality" and win a prize of several thousand rubles. Today the readers' questions are answered by the chairman of the USSR Gosstandart, Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor V.V. Sychev.

[Semenov] Valeriy Vasilyevich, first of all the readers are interested in this question: Will consideration be given to suggestions that have come to the Gosstandart during the course of the discussion of the USSR draft law on product quality and protection of consumer rights?

[Sychev] It was the abundance of this mail, which contained many original and effective suggestions, that led to the idea of organizing a competition. This time the task was formulated extremely precisely. So if someone has worked on something I suggest that they return to it and reduce it to a common denominator.

[Semenov] An economist from Kakhachkala, A. Absalyamov is surprised that the competition lasts 3 months. Is it possible in such a short period of time to submit all the formulas that can improve the mechanism for ensuring quality. He asks the question: Would it not be better to extend the time period for the competition?

[Sychev] We are not counting on receiving any formulas that are as yet unknown to the industrial world. Moreover, we are warning against theorizing. There is no need for that. The highly developed countries have worked out methods and devices for quality control. Experience has also been accumulated in our country. Let us just recall the systems developed previously in Saratov, Gorkiy, and Lvov. This requires not so much time as intellectual baggage, broad erudition, and practical experience. If one is to start from zero, more time will not do any good. Incidentally, frequently the untrained observer would notice what a professional would ignore. This is what we are counting on.

[Semenov] Is there no contradiction in the fact that the Gosstandart has begun to develop the concept of quality control before the law on quality has been adopted.

[Sychev] The lack of a basic concept has led to sharp criticism of the draft law. Rather there was a concept but it was noneconomic in nature. Therefore it was decided to work on it with the help of all who are affected by the law. I agree with those who assert that we need not so much a law on quality as one on poor-quality products. The legal norms, even though they may be cast in the letter of the law, in and of themselves do not provide for quality, but they can and should prevent the escalation of defective work through economic levers and sanctions. In all developed countries the manufacturer is responsible for the output of poor-quality products, and they are criminally liable if the products harm the health of the consumer. In the draft of our law the list of terms does not include such concepts as defect or harm.... In the absence of a market these are the first to have an effect. I should like for these concepts to be reflected in the work submitted for the competition. When working on a concept it is good to envision an entire picture and the logic of the development of our legislation. The law on protection of consumer rights should be based on the package of laws which are now being considered in the Supreme Soviet. It has been correctly stated that the code of laws should be a mould which is gradually filled up. Thus just today we are clearly determining the coordinates of the section that will be occupied by the law on protection of consumer rights.

[Semenov] If possible, tell us in more detail about the requirements the originators of the competition place on the concept.

[Sychev] It is not worthwhile to have an orientation toward large expenditures. It is not only that the state has no money. The reserves we are not using now are quite adequate for the mechanism to work. We just have to be able to put them to work. As concerns the technical side, there is nothing new here. The concept should be based on an all-encompassing principle—"Suppliers of raw materials, processed materials, and batching items—the developer—the manufacturer—transport, trade, and wholesale organizations—the consumer." Quality control should be provided in all stages—from marketing to utilization. The main thing is to be concrete. It is necessary to determine the sequence of actions from the very start—the selection of the initial list of products, work, and services, and also the enterprises and regions where it would be expedient to begin to introduce quality control mechanisms. It is important to reveal precisely the content of the work on all "horizons" beginning with individual workers, whether they be laborers, technologies, designers, technical control workers, or leaders of enterprises, and ending with the responsibility of the ministries and departments and central, republic, and local management organs. Naturally, we are especially interested in how the public sees the tasks of the USSR Gosstandard under the conditions of the changeover from noneconomic methods of influencing quality to economic ones. In other words, how do they see standardization, certification, and verification of productions, metrology, state evaluation, testing, supervision, state receiving, and so forth. I shall discuss certification. I recall that this word comes from the Latin meaning "done correctly." For the consumer the certification mark on an item is a guarantee of quality and for the supplier, a guarantee of success. It is already obvious that we cannot be equal partners on the foreign market without certification. We already have 13 certification centers in operation. But just listen to the list of products that are tested—safety belts, hunting rifles, cotton, explosion-proof electrical equipment.... Do these need to be certified? Of course. But should we really begin with weapons? Again we have taken the path of least resistance. As a result the centers that have been introduced do not put us ahead strategically.

The development of certification needs to be discussed in the works for the competition and in terms of the results of the competition. Where should we begin? What certification should be voluntary and what should be mandatory? Under our conditions how does one motivate the manufacturer to certify products and how does one develop in the consumer confidence in its results? In my opinion, we must introduce mandatory certification of children's toys guaranteeing their safety immediately, without waiting for any laws. We must not delay with food products. The centers for standardization and metrology of Moscow, Leningrad, Belorussia, Moldavia, and the Baltic republics are ready for this work. This is already a good deal. After gaining experience for a year or a year and a half this work should extend to the largest possible number of regions. This is my opinion, which I by no means wish to impose on the entrants in the competition. Using the example of certification I have tried to show: We need not an organized system but actually a concept. A far-reaching calculated algorithm of actions. Relying on world experience, of course.

[Semenov] Then is the Muscovite S. Kamyshev not correct when he suggests, "without getting fancy" using as a basis for the program one that has worked well in some other country.

[Sychev] If everything were that simple the entire world would use the same program which had been "designed" successfully at one time. Nonetheless every counter is developing its own, national program. Relying on world practice, the concept should take into account the peculiarities of our country and the period in which we live. This includes the technical backwardness of a number of enterprises, the low level of labor and production discipline, the deficit, and the monopoly of the producers. While being oriented to the future, we must not break away from reality.

[Semenov] Referring to these and a number of other "peculiarities" of our economy, many readers in general raise doubts about the very possibility of quality control....

[Sychev] This opinion is extremely widespread. But here they forget that both under the conditions of deficit and under conditions of a market that is saturated with goods, the same mechanisms should be in place for protecting the consumer. The only difference is in the degree of their effect. If we do not recognize this we shall reach the market but it will be a market of poor-quality goods.

[Semenov] May foreign specialists and firms participate in the competition? [Sychev] The competition is open to all. I do not think that it will be easier for foreign specialists to be oriented to our problems but their participation will only enrich us.

[Semenov] When do you think the goal of the competition will be reached? [Sychev] When the concept that is developed—and it can also be a synthesis of many ideas—can be used as a basis of a program of organizational and technical measures for control of the quality of products, work, and services, and also a USSR law on protection of the rights of the consumer.

Agricultural

Stroyev Addresses Seminar on Food Production

*PM20101089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Being Masters of the Land," on the 16-17 October Voronezh seminar on food production; addressed by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ye.S. Stroyev]

[Text] An All-Union seminar-conference held in Voronezh 16-17 October examined questions of building up food resources on the basis of the broad utilization of different forms of economic management and accelerated development of the storage and processing base in light of the demands by the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum.

It was attended by the chairmen of kray and oblast soviet executive committees, chairmen of autonomous republic councils of ministers, secretaries and agrarian department chiefs from kray and oblast party committees, leaders of agro-industrial committees from krays, oblasts, and autonomous republics of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], chairmen of oblast and republic unions of consumer trade cooperatives from the country, and leaders of central and republic ministries and departments.

G.S. Kabasin, first secretary of Voronezh Oblast party committee [obkom], spoke of the organizational work being done by party, soviet, and economic organs and cooperative organizations in the oblast to boost foodstuffs production.

Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the participants in the seminar-conference. He noted that the country's gross agricultural output in the past 4 years increased by R20 billion or 10 percent against the average annual level during the 11th 5-Year Plan period. During the same period grain production increased by 26 million tonnes, meat production by 2.8 million tonnes, and milk production by 10.6 million tonnes. Profits at enterprises of the agro-industrial complex increased, the number of loss-making farms fell, and the growth in bank debts was halted.

Nonetheless, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized, the Food Program is not being fulfilled in terms of most categories of crop farming and stockraising production. The past period saw a R29 billion shortfall in gross agricultural output.

The average figures conceal an extremely variegated picture of indicators for individual oblasts, krays, and republics. Even in the present complex economic situation more than 30 oblasts have succeeded in mobilizing all basic components of the agro-industrial complex, successfully coping with deliveries to centralized stocks and substantially improving their own food supplies. A typical example is Voronezh Oblast. Over the last 4 years grain production has increased by half, meat production by 18 percent, and milk production by 10 percent.

There have been gratifying developments in terms of food supplies in Krasnodar, Stavropol, and Altay Krays and in Rostov, Orel, Moscow, Tambov, Ryazan, Kiev, Grodno, Tselinograd, and other oblasts.

Unfortunately, examples of a different kind are more numerous. Many oblasts and republics have marked time for too long, and the food supply situation remains tense.

One of the most acute problems affecting the daily life of millions of people is the social reorganization of the countryside. The countryside lags behind cities in terms of housing amenities and medical, trade, and consumer services, and this has resulted in major social inequalities.

The CPSU Central Committee March plenum decisions created favorable conditions for the unfolding of social transformations everywhere in the countryside. Capital investments in the nonproduction sphere are due to increase by half. But the broader opportunities have to be properly utilized. This is what is actually lacking. The commissioning of apartments on collective farms [kolkhoz] and state farms [sovkhoz] has fallen from 218,000 in 1985 to 181,000 in 1988 in the RSFSR as a whole, and from 34,000 to 27,500 in the Ukraine.

Road construction is still progressing only slowly.

In the elaboration of its new agrarian policy the party relies mainly on measures which make it possible to put an end to man's alienation from the land and other means of production. This means that we need a bolder approach to radical changes in economic relations, the assimilation of full economic accountability, leasing, and collective, family, and individual contracts, and the development of cooperative ties and peasants' farms.

Questions of the storage and processing of agricultural output have acquired special urgency. At present the country produces 260 kg of potatoes per capita, but only 105 kg are used for food purposes. The meat situation is the same. We are producing 68 kg per capita, but only 64 kg reach our tables. Fish catches run to a per capita average of 40 kg, with only 18 kg being used for food. The situation is similar for grain, vegetables, and sugar beet. Losses of sugar during harvesting and processing of beet amount to more than 1 million tonnes. It is necessary to guard reliably against losses, thriftlessness, and wastefulness. To this end it is necessary to create a modern storage and processing base.

The situation in the meat industry is extremely grave. There are not enough refrigerators, and livestock are subjected to long delays and unnecessary shipments over long distances.

It is well known that a special resolution was adopted on questions of food industry development. All machine building ministries, including the defense industry complex, are essentially involved in the retooling of enterprises. There has been a significant increase in appropriations of farms' financial resources for this purpose, with annual investment there running at R5.3 billion, which is almost R1 billion more than the annual average during the last 5-year plan period. Much is being done in this respect in Belgorod, Saratov, Penza, Amur, Kharkov, and Tselinograd Oblasts, Stavropol Kray, and the Belorussian, Lithuanian, and Estonian union republics.

Ye.S. Stroyev then dwelled on questions of work by consumer cooperatives to ensure food supplies for the population. The system of consumer cooperatives has become an organic part of the unified national economic complex, and an important link in economic ties between city and countryside. But the tremendous potential created here is not fully functional. Consumer cooperatives have detached themselves from their participating members, become bureaucratized, and lost their flexible cooperative ties.

Finally, Ye.S. Stroyev said in conclusion, we must fundamentally improve work by party organizations at all levels. Success in all our work will be determined not only by the quantity of foodstuffs delivered, but also by the way we instill social optimism in labor collectives and our entire society, as well as confidence in the correctness and irreversibility of the perestroyka now under way under in our party's leadership.

The seminar-conference was addressed by Ye.I. Sizenko, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; P.S. Fedirko, chairman of the Central Union of Consumer Societies Board; I.A. Mitin, secretary of Ivanovo party obkom; N.P. Shevchenko, chairman of Belgorod Oblast Soviet Executive Committee; and others.

I.I. Skiba, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Department, and leaders of a number of union and republic ministries and departments took part in the seminar-conference's work.

Students Suffer Chemical Illnesses in Sverdlovsk

LD1910135189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0430 GMT on 19 October broadcasts a report by Urals correspondent Yan Khutoranskiy on the "tragedy" of students of the Urals State University who were taking part in harvesting onions in the fields of the Krasnoufimskiy Rayon in Sverdlovsk Oblast. He says "mass illnesses of the peripheral nervous system" have been registered, caused primarily by the "negligence" of those working with chemicals. According to Khutoranskiy, despite the fact that on 8 August a doctor discovered symptoms of illness in the students on the Krasnoufimskiy state farm who were "literally falling from the pain in their joints," and despite the alarm raised by the technical inspectorate of the Sverdlovsk Oblast soviet trade union, workers of the agroindustrial complex just passed it all off with various explanations and adopted a "passive stance."

Khutoranskiy says that 23 students were among the first group to be hospitalized, yet work continued on the field where the concentration of chemicals in the soil was up to 20 times the permitted norm. School pupils were also affected, and after one boy became ill it was discovered that the soil in the patch that he had worked had 120 times the permitted norm of chemical concentration. Seventy more students got ill and four girls had to be sent to Moscow.

Khutoranskiy says that those responsible, the director of the state farm and the chief agronomist, should have been dismissed but they were only given strict reprimands, as were other officials involved. He says that investigations will probably still be carried out, since pesticides are not properly stored, transported, or applied on that state farm. He says that in some areas pesticides banned for use with the given crops were applied and that there is no control over the application of the pesticides.

He says that the symptoms experienced by the students have been noted in other rayons of the oblast. He notes that parents of students of the Ural State University held a 6-hour long meeting and decided not to let their children work on the harvest unless they are given guarantees that their health would not be harmed. "The most terrible thing is that when a check was carried out on that same state farm in October, nothing had changed." The state farm is paying the sick students sick leave and other benefits.

The matter has been handed over to the procuracy, Khutoranskiy notes in conclusion.

Kirghizia Bans Food Exports From Republic

LD2110222489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 21 October carries a 2 and ½ minute report on food production and distribution difficulties. "Tens of thousands of tonnes of vegetables grown on the kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] of Kirghizia will not get to consumers. The republican government has banned export to other regions of the country, even of production surplus to the plan." Frunze correspondent (Aleksandr Mirtov) explains that the reasons for the ban are "the supposedly necessary quarantine on vegetable production, the speculative activity of trading and purchasing cooperatives and the primary necessity of fulfilling economic tasks with regard to state deliveries." An official of the republican State Agricultural Committee says that "it is necessary not to ban, but to, for example, stimulate the development of production by economic methods. As for bans, in my opinion, those times have already passed." The correspondent concludes that this will mean a shortfall of vegetables for the cities of Siberia, the Urals and the Far North, "where, as it is, no particular glut of vegetables is to be observed."

Agricultural Report for 17-22 Oct Period

LD2410053689

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic service in russian on 17-22 October, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

17 October

Tashkent Oblast machine operators are the first in Uzbekistan to start work on the increased obligations account: They have unloaded almost 300,000 tonnes of cotton from the hoppers of their combines. (0100)

By 17 October rice has been harvested on 70,000 hectares of Krasnodar Kray—roughly half the area set aside for this work. (0500)

18 October

Kabarda-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic has overfulfilled its plan for bread-grain procurement by laying in over 200,000 tonnes of high-quality grain. (1400)

Lipetsk Oblast has fulfilled its plan for sugar beet sales to the state. Over 1.72 million tonnes of raw material has been sent to processing plants. (1700)

19 October

In kazakhstan the sowing of winter crops has been completed today, with 2.5 million hectares sown to wheat and rye. The winter field sown to wheat has been increased by 100,000 hectares. (0900)

Sometimes many months of work by thousands of agricultural workers is destroyed with one stroke of a pen. This was once again demonstrated by an inspection carried out by railway workers of the transportation of freight that is quick to spoil: Vegetables, fruit, melons. About 500 rail cars sent from Uzbekistan stood at destination stations from between 5 days to 2 months simply as a result of the receiver's address being entered incorrectly in the documents. Many products spoil as a result of being in shipment too long. Instead of the stipulated 52 hours, refrigerated sections sometimes stand loaded for a week. (1200)

Turkmenistan fulfilled its annual task in mechanical harvest of cotton. More than 800,000 tonnes which is the main part of the crop, arrived in storage. (1600)

20-21 October

No relevant items.

22 October

Picking cotton and grapes has stopped in Azerbaijan due to rain. Cotton growers of Azerbaijan have procured 572,076 tonnes of cotton since the beginning of the season, thus fulfilling the plan by 90.3 percent. This was reported by the State Statistics Committee of the republic on 21 October. (0204)

The plan for sales of sugar beets has been fulfilled in Mordovia. More than 205,000 tonnes of it have been sent to the procurement centers, and sales are continuing. (0500)

Collective and state farms in Altay Kray have completed the harvest of sunflower seed. A total of 120,000 hectares of land were under this crop. (0500)

Military

Akhromeyev notes 1990 military spending cuts

AU2310162289 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1500 GMT 23 Oct 89

[Text] The Soviet draft military budget for 1990 is set down at about R71 billion. This is about R6.5 billion less than this year and R12 billion less than at the beginning of the 5-year plan, Sergey Akhromeyev, Mikhail Gorbachev's military adviser, told the GDR radio. The reduction in the budget is carried out by reducing serial production of combat technology, work in military research, tests, and construction, and the construction of new military facilities. According to Akhromeyev, half of the Soviet defense industry is already working for civilian purposes at the moment. Concerning home electronics and civilian planes it already has a monopoly. Thus, what is involved in the reduction are complicated technologies. Akhromeyev stressed that unilateral reduction measures by the USSR are possible only up to a certain point. This point depends on the military political situation in the world.

57 Die in Transcaucusus Crash of Il-76 Transport

LD2110111389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0330 GMT 21 Oct 89

[From the "120 Minutes" program: Interview with A.F. Barcuk, deputy commander in chief of the USSR Air Force, by unidentified correspondent; date, place not given—recorded]

[Text] As has been reported already, an Il-76 military transport aircraft crashed on take off in the Transcaucasian Military District and was destroyed. Our correspondent met the deputy commander in chief of our country's Air Force and asked him to comment on this report in more detail:

[Barcuk] The Il-76 aircraft was piloted by Colonel (Aleksandr Nikolayevich Kolmykov), who was the captain. Three minutes after take off, after some altitude had been achieved, the pilot discovered that the left-hand engine was on fire.

[Correspondent] The on-board fire-extinguishing system was working?

[Barcuk] The on-board fire extinguishing system started working automtically. Two and a half minutes after the fire started on board the aircraft, the left engine fell off and fell to the ground. This engine was later found. The flight then continued with a fire that engulfed the entire left part of the aircraft as it approached the airstrip. At a distance of 6-8 km, the plane began to lose altitude rapidly and fell into the sea, engulfed in flames. The plane fell into the sea 700 meters from the shore.

[Correspondent] How many years had the plane been in service?

[Barcuk] The plane had been in service since 1983. No repairs had been carried out on this aircraft. When the plane crashed, it was destroyed and all the members of the crew—7 people, and the 50 passengers on board—were killed. At the present time, in light of the storm conditions at sea, it has not been possible to find any significant parts of the aircraft apart from fragments. The tail of the aircraft, which is at a depth of 7 meters, is protruding above the surface of the sea and individual pieces have been washed ashore. Of course, we all are concerned about where the flight recording system, the so-called black box is, but this black box has not been found for the time being.

[Correspondent] Were there any possibilities for those on board the plane to save themselves, for example, for them to get out of the plane?

[Barcuk] I cannot tell you now exactly. The commission obviously will decide whether there might have been such an opportunity. The crew were carrying out air transportation of servicemen and military cargo. No landing exercises by the troops had been planned. For that reason, it is difficult to talk about whether or not they might have been able to save themselves using their parachutes. On board were two combat assault vehicles and one 266 vehicle.

[Correspondent] They have not been found?

[Barcuk] They have not been found, either. [video shows map of crash area]

Chernavin Discusses Aircraft Carrier Policy

PM2010110189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin by special correspondent V. Chebakov: "Commentary by Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, Commander in Chief of the Navy"—date and place unspecified]

[Text] [Chebakov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, more than 40 years ago we rejected the concept of developing and building aircraft-carrying vessels. Why have we changed this decision? Do we need aircraft carriers? After all, they have always been considered the strike units of any fleet. How does this square with the policy of arms reduction and the country's defensive doctrine?

[Chernavin] I think you're wrong. Before the war, in the late thirties, the idea of building aircraft carriers in our country was reflected in the last prewar program. We were to have built two carriers in the mid-forties, one for the Northern Fleet and the other for the Pacific Fleet, but the outbreak of war stopped the project from going ahead. After the war the shipbuilding industry had been destroyed. Aircraft carriers are the most costly ships of all. We could not afford to build one. We had no experience in it or opportunity to do so, and there were no skilled construction workers or military specialists who could have operated a carrier. After the war the task was set of rapidly restoring the existing fleet with the least expenditure.

Purposeful research and development on aircraft-carrying ships began in 1952-1953. It was decided to move from the simple to the complex. The elaboration of draft materials on the first helicopter-carrying ships in 1962 was the first such step. This was simpler and cheaper. The two helicopter-carriers "Leningrad" and "Moskva," which are now part of the Black Sea Fleet, were built in 1967 and 1969. They have served in the Mediterranean for 20 years and carry out long voyages. But at sea a helicopter-carrier has limited use—anti-submarine warfare [ASW].

A vertical take-off and landing [VTOL] Yak first landed on the ASW vessel "Moskva" late in 1972. The first aircraft-carrying ship—the "Kiev"—entered service in 1975. It carried VTOL attack aircraft and helicopters—that is, combined aviation armaments.

In 1976 a program was adopted on the need to gear naval aviation to perform fighter tasks. The VTOL deck-borne aircraft were attack aircraft, but now we needed to have fighters on our carriers—that is, aircraft to assume the defense role. Therefore, when people ask today whether the construction of aircraft-carrying ships contravenes our defensive doctrine, I reply: no. We see their main role as platforms for fighter aircraft able to provide long-range cover for our vessels when shore-based fighters are unable to help. This defensive function is enshrined in the new aircraft carrier "Tbilisi," which you have visited. The Navy currently has four aircraft-carrying ships in service. But they do not fully correspond to the role which we need them to carry out in the future, bearing in mind what I have said.

[Chebakov] Does this mean that in the concept of our armed forces aircraft carriers are defensive weapons?

[Chernavin] Yes. But what does defensive mean? Certain people have a simplistic and primitive understanding of this. They think that since we have adopted this doctrine, we should be purely passive, defend ourselves, and, in the event of conflict, retreat deep into our territory. Yet modern warfare—be it on land, sea, or in the air—is, above all, fluid. How can a warship fight today if it "sits in the trenches?" Submarines should find the enemy and sink them. A surface ship's mission is, if necessary, to inflict missile strikes on the enemy without waiting for them to enter our territorial waters. All the more so as, according to Western specialists, aircraft carriers have a range of around 1,500 km.

[Chebakov] Seeing the unique and highly complex electronics on the aircraft carrier "Tbilisi," one doubts whether a draftee sailor could master this equipment even in 3 years. Do you not think that only ensigns and officers should serve on such vessels?

[Chernavin] The Navy and its ships today differ from all branches of the Armed Forces in that our people serve a year longer. Everywhere else service lasts 2 years, but with us it lasts 3 years. This is due to the complexity of modern equipment. It is far harder to run a strategic submarine or a carrier than it is to use any shore-based equipment. As long as service in the Navy lasts for 3 years I do not think that there should only be ensigns and officers aboard ship. Yes, there are jobs which require highly professional knowledge and experience. But in certain places tasks can be carried out by sailors. For instance, you don't need a lot of electronics training to moor a ship. There are many naval specialities which are accessible to draftee sailors.

Today certain people's deputies are stating from lofty rostrums that the length of the draft in the Navy should be reduced by a year. This would put the Navy in an extremely difficult position. If such a decision were made, almost all the main posts on warships would have to be manned by professionals, by officers, ensigns, and career sailors. It currently takes around a year to train ship specialists in a training section. They then put to sea and take the same time to master the ins and outs of a ship. It would be impossible to sail with a 2-year crew.

As commander in chief, I submit to the defense minister my proposals for solving any problems that crop up. These options are linked with the allocation of additional funds to the Navy. Our sailors earn R5-7 [presumably per day]—no volunteers are going to serve for that amount of money. I recently visited Britain with the USSR defense minister. We visited the carrier "Invincible." I asked first-year volunteers there the question: "How much do you earn?" Their answer was "33 pounds sterling a day." I asked whether they had any staffing difficulties. "We have so many wanting to join up that we can choose the ones we need." In conversation the first sea lord told me that their main task is to constantly keep service pay higher than for any other category of worker in Britain, and then there are no problems.

[Chebakov] The crew of the "Tbilisi" has been drawn from more than a dozen warships. Aren't you worried that the best people may not have been sent to the carrier? After all, it is the flagship....

[Chernavin] The staffing system, which has been worked out in the Navy over the course of many years, rules out the possibility of people trying to send their worst performers to new ships. The crew will be confirmed by a Navy-wide commission, which attentively studies the opinions of the commanders of formations, ships, and combat units. The new collective is then seconded for a long period to ships of this formation. We attentively monitor the crew at all stages—from the initial construction to the handover ceremony and the cruiser's sea trials. During this period the command may change some of the personnel: Some may get ill, others may encounter unforeseen circumstances, others may show themselves to be undisciplined. This is the way the crew is finally formed. These measures make sure that we don't get anyone who isn't up to scratch.

[Chebakov] No aircraft has yet made a conventional landing on a Soviet vessel. How much time will it take to train an entire air regiment to carry out this mission?

[Chernavin] The training for the pilots who will be based on the carrier "Tbilisi" began several years ago. They develop their skills under conditions approximating those they will encounter at sea. There are specially built stands and airfields simulating ship decks, and the technical equipment which makes it possible take off from and land on a carrier has been set up. Of course, initially only the very best crews will be flying. But when the ship is commissioned the pilots will be able to learn to carry out the full range of combat missions on the vessel.

The training of carrier-borne naval pilots is a very complex undertaking. We currently train them in their Air Force colleges. We once had our own college, but it was closed down. We are now asking yet again whether such a college should be opened. Air Force pilots have to be retrained, which takes more than a year. We are currently putting additional resources—both human and material resources—into this. Not every Air Force college graduate who flies successfully over land can be turned into a naval pilot.

[Chebakov] "Tbilisi," "Riga," "Ulyanovsk".... Where do these ship names come from?

[Chernavin] They are issued to individual classes, classifications, and types of vessel so that they may be distinguished from other vessels even by their name. Aircraft-carrying ships, for instance, have been named for union republic capitals and large cities. We name large ASW ships for naval leaders.

[Chebakov] How old, in your view, should the aircraft carrier's commanding officer be? And could you say a few words about the appointee.

[Chernavin] On the one hand, such a complex vessel needs a strong man—both physically and morally strong. The younger the better, one would think. On the other hand, we mustn't be guided purely by physical condition, because you yourself have seen just what an aircraft carrier is like. The commanding officer should be an experienced sailor able to make independent and responsible decisions. He should be wise. We need an ideal combination. I think that the commander should be between 37 and 40.

Captain First Class Viktor Yarygin has been appointed to the carrier "Tbilisi." He is a graduate of the Higher Naval College and the Naval Academy. Until recently he had commanded an artillery cruiser. He is 42, a party member, married, and the recipient of state awards. We are pinning great hopes on Yarygin. After all, he will be the trailblazer. We hope that his knowledge and industriousness will help the carrier "Tbilisi" to become the best ship in the Northern Fleet.